

LIBRARY
OF THE
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
AT
PRINCETON, N. J.

DONATION OF
SAMUEL AGNEW,

OF PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Letter

81-1
14

No...

May 22⁸ 1861.

Case,

Shelf,

Book,

5CC
3447



HISTORY OF THE ORGANIZATION
OF THE
METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, SOUTH.

COMPREHENDING ALL THE
OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE GENERAL CONFERENCE;
THE SOUTHERN ANNUAL CONFERENCES, AND
THE GENERAL CONVENTION;

WITH SUCH OTHER MATTERS
AS ARE NECESSARY TO A RIGHT UNDERSTANDING OF THE CASE.

NASHVILLE:

COMPILED AND PUBLISHED BY THE EDITORS AND PUBLISHERS OF THE SOUTH-WESTERN
CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE, FOR THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, SOUTH.
BY ORDER OF THE LOUISVILLE CONVENTION.

William Cameron, Printer.

1845.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2011 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library



P R E F A C E.

THE Convention of Delegates from the Annual Conferences in the slaveholding States, held in Louisville, Ky., in May, 1845, after having resolved to organize The Methodist Episcopal Church, South, deemed it necessary to lay before the public a historical statement of the events which led to the formation of a distinct ecclesiastical connexion, and of the organization of that connexion, in order to a better understanding of the action, principles and motives of Southern Methodists in the premises, and to preserve for future time a faithful record of those important facts which might now be collected with facility, but which, if not embodied in a permanent form, would be liable to be lost to posterity.

• In accordance with this design, the undersigned were appointed a committee to compile and publish a History of the Organization of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, under certain instructions given by the Convention. They have accordingly endeavored in the best manner in their power, under the circumstances, to fulfil the important trust confided to them, and now present to the public the fruit of their labors.

It is matter of regret, that as all the members of the committee have been compelled, regularly and much the greater portion of their time, to be employed in other duties which could not be neglected, the work has been compiled at intervals redeemed from other duties, and not as would have been desirable, by giving to it undivided and continuous attention. If, on this account, the work shall be found to possess defects or blemishes, the committee console themselves with the somewhat confident hope, that every thing of real importance to

the subject will be found recorded, though in a form less perfect than was wished. Though the compilers are identified with the Southern organization in fact, feeling and principle, they have endeavored to state facts and arguments with fairness and candor.

It may be proper to remark, that compliance with that part of the committee's instructions which required the publication of all the speeches delivered in the General Conference and in the Convention on the subject, was found impracticable. A very large proportion of the speeches delivered in the Convention, were not furnished to the committee, and it was not deemed advisable to publish a part without the whole, nor to publish those of the General Conference without those of the Convention; consequently all have been omitted. Should it be judged best, they may, at a future time, be embodied in a separate volume.

Having acted with reference to the glory of God and the good of his church in performing the work assigned them, the committee now, in sending it abroad to the world, humbly commend it to the Divine blessing.

December, 1845.

J. B. McFERRIN,
M. M. HENKLE,
A. L. P. GREEN,
F. E. PITTS,
JOHN W. HANNER.

INTRODUCTION.

THE subject of slavery has been one of great perplexity in the Methodist Church, from the time at which it first was made a subject of Church legislation. And had the Church followed the example of Christ and his Apostles in this respect, and left the gospel, in the exercise of its inherent energies, to work out its legitimate results on the civil relations and moral duties of society, the effect would probably have been much more beneficial on all the relations involved, than it has been by pursuing an opposite course of policy. At an early period, however, in the history of American Methodism,—when there were but twenty-four preachers who “agreed to sit in Conference on the original plan as Methodists,” and several years before the organization of a Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States—it was deemed advisable by those preachers to legislate on the subject of slavery, and it has been a fruitful source of difficulty ever since. The first action of this kind, of which we have any account, occurred at a Conference held in Baltimore, in April, 1780, “where the Northern preachers only attended.”—*Lee’s Hist. of Meth.*, p. 70.

The following is their enactment:—

“*Quest.* Ought not this Conference to require those traveling preachers who hold slaves, to give promises to set them free?”

“*Ans.* Yes.

“*Quest.* Does this Conference acknowledge that slavery is contrary to the laws of God, man, and nature, and hurtful to society; contrary to the dictates of conscience and pure religion, and doing that which we would not others should do to us and ours? Do we pass our disapprobation on all our friends who keep slaves, and advise their freedom?”

Of this action, Mr. Lee, the early and faithful historian of the Church, says:—“It is evident that the preachers in this case went too far in their censures; and their language in their resolves was calculated to irritate the minds of our peo-

ple, and by no means calculated to convince them of their errors."

The Conference having entered on this dangerous business, could not well abandon it, though often compelled to change, modify, repeal, suspend, and re-enact, from that time down to the final consummation of the work in 1844.

In one material point, this first action was more exceptionable than any which followed it, previous to the last: it recognizes no exception under the requirement to manumit, in favor of persons who are restrained by State laws from manumitting their slaves.

In all other action, save that of 1844, this exception is fairly recognized, as will be seen by reference to the various enactments on this subject; and much as has been said, officially and unofficially, of the stringency, the severity, the "injurious and ruinous tendencies" of the enactments of 1784, '96, 1800, and others, none of them all brings the Church into such direct and irreconcilable antagonism with the laws of the country as the *first* and the *last*—those of 1780 and 1844.

In 1783, certain vague menaces (for lack of a better name) were made against slaveholders, but they were against those only "who held slaves *contrary to the laws which authorize their freedom.*" In April, 1784, action was taken against those local preachers "who will not emancipate their slaves *in the States where the laws admit it,*" and at the same Conference, those traveling preachers who "refuse to manumit their slaves *where the law permits.*"

In December of the same year, by the Conference which gave name and organization to the Church, were enacted those ultra and severe rules which had to be suspended in six months after their passage, and which have ever been condemned by the united voice of the world and the Church, as impolitic and ruinous. Yet these universally condemned rules have this explanatory clause appended to them:—"These rules are to affect the members of our society no farther than *as they are consistent with the laws of the States in which they reside.*" And even in a State which permitted emancipation, the same Conference enacted that the brethren should "have *two years* from the notice given, to consider the expedience of compliance or non-compliance with these rules."

The rules of 1796 were to be enforced only "*as the laws of the States respectively, and the circumstances of the case will admit.*"

Agreeably to the law of 1800, now in force, and applicable to the cases of Mr. Harding and Bishop Andrew, traveling preachers becoming the owners of slaves, are required to "execute, if it be *practicable*, a legal emancipation of such slaves, conformably to the laws of the State in which they live."

In 1804, members were authorized to *sell slaves* in cases where a committee might judge it to be an act of "mercy or humanity" to do so. At the same time, persons residing in "North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Tennessee," (States understood as prohibiting emancipation,) were *exempted* from the operation of the rules.

In 1808, the General Conference, finding the subject utterly unmanageable, abolished all rules respecting slaveholding among the membership of the Church, and authorized "each Annual Conference to form its own regulations *relative to buying and selling slaves.*"

In 1812, this last regulation was re-enacted, prefaced by an explanatory clause, assigning as the reason of the rule, "that the laws of some of the States *do not admit emancipation*, without a special act of the legislature."

The law of 1816 declares slaveholders ineligible to any official station in the Church, where "*the laws of the State in which they live will admit of emancipation, and permit the liberated slave to enjoy freedom.*"

This necessary exception in favor of persons who are not permitted, by the laws of the States in which they reside, to emancipate their slaves, appears never to have been lost sight of after the first random action on the subject, down to 1840. In the General Conferences of 1836 and 1840, it was fully recognized. The address of the latter Conference to the British Wesleyan Conference, holds the following explicit language on this subject:—"It is impossible to frame a rule on slavery, proper for all our people in all the States alike. But our Church is extended through all the States, and as it would be wrong and unscriptural to enact rules of discipline *in opposition to the constitution and laws of the State on this subject*, so also would it not be *equitable or scriptural to confound the positions of our ministers and people*, (so different as they are in different States,) with respect to the *moral question* which slavery involves. Under the administration of the venerable Dr. Coke, this plain distinction was once overlooked, and it was attempted to urge emancipation in all the States; but the attempt proved *almost ruinous*, and was soon abandoned by the Doctor himself."

It was this keeping aloof from the stronger forms of direct antagonism with civil authority and State laws, that enabled the Church to maintain a footing in the South proper at all. But while this was done, it was no more than *barely* done, and such, therefore, was the position of the Church as to keep the civil authorities feelingly alive to any, the least, encroachment, or even approach to their ground. When, therefore, the General Conference of 1844, required of two of her min-

isters the performance of that which the State laws forbade and made penal, thus enjoining a violation of the civil laws as a moral duty—or at least an ecclesiastical one, and bringing the Church into conflict with the State, however strongly the measure may have been demanded by the state of popular sentiment and feeling in the North, the representatives of the Church South felt that they were compelled to disavow the whole proceeding, and disconnect themselves from it entirely, or be themselves ejected from their fields of labor, and see Methodism utterly rooted out and banished from the great South. What they have done, they did under a solemn conviction of uncontrollable necessity and positive duty to God, themselves, the Church, and the world. And that the true character of their circumstances, their action, and their motives, might be known and read of all men, they have directed the compilation of this brief History of the Organization of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South.



HISTORY OF THE ORGANIZATION OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, SOUTH.

CHAPTER I.

From the meeting of the General Conference of 1844 to the conclusion of the case of Mr. Harding.

A SHORT time previous to the meeting of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, in 1844, there seemed to be a general expectation throughout most parts of the Church, that the question which had caused so much difficulty for a period of sixty years, would not be likely at that Conference to produce its ordinary amount of excitement and agitation, and that the session would be one of unusual harmony, especially in so far as the subject of Slavery and Abolition were concerned. But about the time of the assembling of the Conference, it became generally understood that in portions of the North numerous petitions, of abolition character, had been gotten up, and would be laid before the General Conference, bringing up the whole subject for some form of action. At the same time, it became known in the North, that the Rev. James Osgood Andrew, one of the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, had become in some way connected with slavery; and soon the expectation came to be general, that a trying conflict awaited the Conference.

Accordingly, so soon as the organizing and introductory business—which occupied the first two days—was despatched, on the third day of the session, a petition from a Northern Annual Conference, on the subject of slavery, was introduced, which at once opened the controversy. For beside the exciting character of the subject embraced in the petition, it was expressed in language which many members considered discourteous, and even disrespectful to the General Conference; and a leading member who afterwards voted with the majority throughout, spoke of those expressions as “highly exceptionable.” After some debate, the petition was, however, referred to a committee raised on that general subject.

On the fifth day of the session, a resolution was offered, instructing the slavery committee to report *directly* and *explicitly* on the points referred to them in the petitions presented, and as speedily as possible. Upon this resolution a spirited controversy grew up, in which considerable feeling was manifested, and in which six or seven members participated. On the following day, the sixth of the session, the subject came up again in a new form, and under circumstances which evidently exerted a capital influence in giving direction and character to the whole subsequent action of the General Conference on this subject. Rev. Francis A. Harding had been *suspended* by the Baltimore Conference, of which he was a member, for failing to manumit certain slaves which had come into his possession by marriage; and the case came up before the General Conference on appeal from the decision of the Baltimore Conference. The official record showed the following proceedings in the case on the part of the Baltimore Conference, after its reference to a committee:—

“The committee reported, that Mr. Harding had become possessed of five slaves: one named Harry, aged fifty-two; one woman, named Maria, aged fifty; one man, named John, aged twenty-two; a girl, named —, aged thirteen; and a child, aged two years; and recommended the following preamble and resolution for adoption:—

“Whereas the Baltimore Conference cannot, and will not, tolerate slavery in any of its members,—

“*Resolved*, That brother Harding be required to execute a deed of manumission, and have the same enrolled in the proper court, and give to this Conference, during this present session, a pledge that this shall be done during the present year.

“Brother Harding having stated the impossibility, with his views, of his compliance with this resolution, Mr. Collins moved for his suspension until he gave sufficient assurance of his compliance.

“The matter was again referred to a committee of five, for further investigation, who reported that they had entirely failed to induce brother Harding to comply with the wishes of the Conference.

“Brothers Collins and Emory moved the following resolution, which was adopted:—

“‘*Resolved*, That brother Harding be suspended until the next Annual Conference, or until he assures the Episcopacy that he has taken the necessary steps to secure the freedom of his slaves.’”

This case derived much of its importance and influence from the fact that it came from what is called a *conservative* Conference, and one which had previously acted with the South in

resisting the encroachments of abolitionism. The abolition North constantly denounced slavery as necessarily and under all circumstances a sin, and consistently and perseveringly contended for its entire banishment from the Church, in all its forms and relations. The South, though admitting slavery to be a great evil, as declared in the Discipline, maintained that it was not necessarily sinful in all cases, and that it was impossible for the Church to exist in the South in a state of entire disconnection from this civil institution of the country. The middle, or conservative Conferences, though anti-slavery in principle, had uniformly, for a long period, concurred with the practical views of the South, and co-operated with them in opposing Northern encroachments upon this conservative ground of the Discipline. In this case, the South regarded the Baltimore Conference, and those acting with it, as abandoning the vital conservatism of the Discipline, and the only ground upon which the Church in the South could possibly enjoy security or even existence, and as yielding to abolitionism the distinguishing principle by which it is characterized.

Harding had married a lady who was the owner of five slaves, and as he refused to manumit them, it was contended that he had violated the law of the Discipline governing the case, and he was punished accordingly. That law reads thus: "When any traveling preacher becomes an owner of a slave or slaves, by any means, he shall forfeit his ministerial character in our Church, unless he execute, if it be practicable, a legal emancipation of said slaves, conformably to the laws of the State in which he lives."

The whole matter of course turned on the question, was it "practicable" for Harding to execute such "a legal emancipation, conformably to the laws of the State in which he lived"? He maintained that it was not practicable, and that to require him to do what was legally impracticable, was a violation of the law of the Discipline. His advocate, Dr. W. A. Smith, of Virginia, defended him in this position on the two following general grounds: first, that he was not the legal owner of the slaves; and secondly, that if he were, the laws of Maryland did not permit emancipation. In support of these grounds of defence, the legal opinions of Mr. Justice Merrick, and of Judge Key, were introduced and read, as follows:—

"At the request of Mr. Harding, I have to state, that under the laws of Maryland, no slave can be emancipated, to remain in that State, nor unless provision be made by the person emancipating him for his removal from the State, which removal must take place, unless for good and sufficient reason, the competent authorities grant permission to the manumitted slave to remain.

"There has lately (winter of 1843) been a statute enacted by the State Legislature, securing to married females the property (slaves of course included) which was theirs at the time of their marriage, and protecting it from the power and liabilities of their husbands. [Signed] WM. D. MERRICK."

"The Rev. Mr. Harding having married Miss Swan, who, at the time of her marriage, was entitled to some slaves, I am requested to say, Whether he can legally manumit them, or not? By an act of Assembly, no person can manumit a slave in Maryland: and by another act of our Assembly, a husband has no other or further right to his wife's slaves than their labor, while he lives. He can neither sell nor liberate them. Neither can he and his wife, either jointly or separately, manumit her slaves, by deed, or otherwise. A reference to the Acts of Assembly of Maryland will show this. EDMUND KEY.

"*Prince George county, April 25, 1844.*"

The different statutes of the State of Maryland to the same effect, were also introduced and read. It was thus made to appear quite evident that the Conference had required of Mr. Harding, as necessary to maintain his ministerial standing, an act which was prohibited by the law of the State, and with regard to property which the law withheld from his legal ownership. The able representative of the Baltimore Conference in the case, the Rev. John A. Collins, endeavored, however, to counteract the whole force of this proof, by showing that emancipation *was* practicable, by removing the liberated slave beyond the limits of the State. This is most true, for no State law can operate out of the limits of the State by which it was enacted; but it is equally true of every State in the Union; and thus by making emancipation *practicable* every where and by every man, it renders the apparently important condition of "practicability," as found in the law of the Discipline, as singularly absurd as it is inoperative and unmeaning.

With regard to the impossibility of manumission by Harding, on the ground that the law vested the property in his wife, and gave him no legal control of the matter whatever, the advocate of the Baltimore Conference took ground rather calculated to excite unpleasant apprehensions, than to convince the opposite party of the correctness of his doctrines. Some regarded him as making the will of the Baltimore Conference superior to the statutes of the State, and independent of the law of the Discipline. The manner in which he arraigned and denounced that law of Maryland, was thought to augur inauspiciously for whatever called for any thing like respectful deference to the civil regulations of the country. The following are some of his remarks on that subject:—

"The law of 1843 is a strange and singular law. Its fundamental feature is against the law of God, for that makes man the head of his wife, and this law takes from him the position assigned to him by the Supreme Being. And I am satisfied that this law will work such evil, that as a matter of necessity it will have to be repealed. I hope, therefore, that you will not judge us by this law. We cannot answer for the tergiversation of the laws of Maryland, and cannot conform to all their changes. As they have gone so far as to pass a law deposing man from his rightful place in the domestic economy—a place assigned to him from the beginning of time by positive divine injunction, they may pass a law requiring him to obey his wife.

"He wished also to correct another wrong impression. It was partially believed that the Baltimore Conference in suspending Mr. Harding had acted in ignorance of the law of 1843. He begged to correct this misconception. They had before them the opinion of Justice Merrick with regard to this very law. But he would say boldly that if the law had been *tenfold what it is*, if it had actually, *outright, and downright, without any possibility of avoiding it, taken these slaves from Harding's control, the Conference would still have acted just as they did; because they did not intend to change their ground, and could not pretend to alter their views with every shifting of the Legislature.* Beside, the Legislature did not compel Mr. Harding to become a slaveholder."

Very much to the same effect spoke another representative of the Baltimore Conference on that occasion, the Rev. Mr. Griffith. He remarked,—

"He [Mr. Harding] could disentangle himself in an hour if he liked, the laws of Maryland, notwithstanding. In point of fact, the law against manumission was inoperative. It would be indeed strange if a freeman had not the right to make that disposal of his property which he might please to make.—Maryland had never said that a slave might be taken up and sold—she had never declared that slaves were property, and then in the same breath, that men should not do what they thought fit with their own property, and that she assumed the right to do that which she forbade the owner doing. No, sir, they know that a man has a right to set his slaves free—they know the *illegality and imperfection* of any act to the contrary—and yet they *try to control* it, and ward off the consequences by this kind of — he hardly knew how to designate such kind of legislation."

This avowed, and almost boasted disregard, if not contempt, for the laws of the land, did not fail to produce alarm as to the security of personal character, and the stability of the union of the Church; especially when the whole was placed primarily

on an unauthorized Annual Conference resolution, contravening the provisions of the law of the Church, and was so shaped and applied as to include, by implication, in its condemnatory scope, hundreds perhaps of ministers, who had felt themselves protected alike by the law of God and the Church, in the peculiar relations they were compelled to sustain.

There were, to be sure, various minor points involved in the case, which might have had an influence on the decision; but we have only to do with the great leading principles avowed and advocated by the majority. The case, after having been before the Conference five or six days, was finally disposed of, on the 11th of May,—the General Conference refusing to reverse the decision of the Baltimore Conference, by a vote of 117 to 56.

There were two things especially in this case which gave painful concern to the Southern members, as indicating a prevailing tendency to a union of the Conservatives and Abolitionists against the South, and against the Discipline. The first was, an openly avowed purpose, as we have seen, to disregard the requirements of State laws where they came into conflict with Annual Conference resolutions or plans of administering the Discipline, and that purpose carried fully into practical effect, as in the present case. The second was a new construction put on the slavery law of the Discipline, intended to justify such conflict with statutory enactments, and resistance of them.

There are two Church enactments, passed at different periods, different in phraseology, but heretofore understood to be of equivalent import; the one applying specifically to *itinerant preachers*, the other generally to *official members*. The advocate of the Baltimore Conference, and representative of conservative Northern opinions, gave the following interpretation of these Church statutes:—

“*Official Members*. The rule on this point takes a stronger tie, and is different in that respect to the rule affecting private members.

““We declare that we are as much as ever convinced of the great evil of slavery: therefore no slaveholder shall be eligible to any official station in our Church hereafter, where the laws of the State in which he lives will admit of emancipation, and *permit the liberated slave to enjoy freedom.*”

“Official members are required to emancipate. The private member is not. He must manumit, but still the rule comes down with comparatively less strictness, *applying only* in such States as will permit the slave to ‘*enjoy his freedom.*’

“*Traveling Preachers*. Here the Discipline is still more stringent.

“When any traveling preacher becomes the owner of a slave or slaves, by any means, he shall forfeit his ministerial character in our Church, unless he execute, if it be practicable, a legal emancipation of such slaves, conformably to the laws of the State in which he lives.”

“Here nothing is said about the liberated slave being *permitted to enjoy freedom*. The simple act of manumission is treated of, and made *compulsory* on the traveling preacher. ‘If it be practicable,’ he is to manumit. There is no other condition; the exception is narrowed down, and then the law is binding, and *compels* him to manumit.”

It had been before contended, as we have seen, that legislative enactments of a prohibitory character, did not render manumission “impracticable;” and here we learn that wherever it is practicable, (and that is every where, agreeably to this doctrine,) the rule is *compulsory* on the traveling preacher, whether the manumitted slave can enjoy *freedom*, or is subject to re-enslavement.* This new construction, especially when carried out by a large majority of the General Conference, the Southern delegates regarded as a practical nullification of the protective exceptions to the slavery law of the Church; and they felt assured that upon these principles, no man who was in any way connected with slavery, was secure in his ministerial standing, no matter what legal encumbrances or disabilities might be thrown about his circumstances. The force of this reasoning, or rather *construction*, it is true, was attempted to be met by Harding’s advocate, by bringing a declaratory resolution of the General Conference of 1840 to bear on the case. That resolution appeared to be full to the point, and quite conclusive. It reads thus:—

“*Resolved*, by the delegates of the several Annual Confer-

* This doctrine or construction of law is certainly at variance with the received opinions of the Church. The Bishops, in their address to the General Conference of 1840, hold this language on this point: “In *all* enactments of the Church relating to slavery, a due and respectful regard has been had to the laws of the States, *never requiring emancipation in contravention of civil authority, or where the laws of the States would not allow the liberated slave to enjoy his freedom.*” The answer of the same General Conference to the Address of the British Conference, held similar language, and the same doctrine, in the following passage: “While, therefore, the Church has encouraged emancipation in those States *where the laws permit it, and allowed the freed man to enjoy freedom*, we have refrained, for conscience sake, from all intermeddling with the subject in those other States where the laws make it criminal.” Agreeably to this doctrine of the Bishops and of the General Conference, in *all* cases, where either emancipation is impracticable, or the emancipated slave cannot enjoy freedom, the holder of slaves is fully protected by the law of the Discipline. And this view of the law, it is believed, was universal, up to the General Conference of 1844. Nay, more; even in that Conference, the author of the resolution adopted against Bishop Andrew, Mr. Finley, strongly contends for the same doctrine. He says, “When the master cannot set his slaves free, *and that slave enjoy his freedom*;—when it is beyond the power of the master to *free his slave*, or that slave to *enjoy his freedom*, slavery is fixed on the *absolute necessity* of the case; and if there be any such case, *it could not and should not be called a sin.*”

ences, in General Conference assembled, That under the provisional exception of the 'general rule of the Church on the subject of slavery, the simple holding of slaves, or mere ownership of slave property, in States or Territories where the laws do not admit of emancipation, *and permit the liberated slave to enjoy freedom*, constitutes no legal barrier to the election or ordination of ministers to the various grades of office known in the ministry of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and cannot, therefore, be considered as operating any forfeiture of right in view of such election or ordination."

This, as it embraced "the various *grades of office* known in the ministry," it was insisted, covered the whole ground and determined the proper course of action. But the opposing advocate contended most earnestly that the resolution could have no possible application to the present case, as it was adopted exclusively with reference to the case of certain local preachers resident in the Virginia portion of the Baltimore Conference territory, from whom ordination had been withheld on account of their connection with slavery, and upon whose grievance, as laid before the General Conference of 1840, this action was taken.

The proper adjustment of this question is certainly a very important point in the general issue; for if this be indeed an official decision of the General Conference, applicable to *all ministers*, having the authority of a declaratory act of the body, then it utterly defeats the position assumed in the case of Harding. It is therefore material that the true design and bearing of the resolution be compassed, if possible. The language could not well be broader or more comprehensive than it is, had the object been to embrace the entire ministry, traveling as well as local; and we must go beyond the resolution itself, which includes specifically "the various grades of office known in the ministry," to find a less inclusive import to the language. As the history of the resolution, however, is given in explanation of its true meaning, the fidelity of history demands a still fuller account of the origin and object of this enactment. The case of certain local preachers—known as the Westmoreland case—was referred to a committee in the General Conference of 1840, and at the same time the petitions, &c., on the subject of slavery, were referred to a committee on slavery of one member from each Conference. This latter committee reported before the first named one, but did not report on the various particular points presented in the papers referred to them.* This was unsatisfactory to many, and a

*We have seen that to prevent the bringing in of a like indeterminate report at the General Conference of 1844, a resolution was introduced presently after the opening of the Session, instructing the Committee on Slavery to "report *directly* on the *points*, the alleged *facts* and *arguments* submitted, &c."

remedy was sought to be applied, by requesting the special committee on the Westmoreland case, to frame their report with a view to that end. The account of this matter we give in the language of one whose intimate connection with the transaction enabled him to understand all its details more perfectly than any other individual. He says, "The committee [Westmoreland committee] were respectfully requested by all the *Bishops in council*, when it was ascertained that the general committee did not intend to do so, to prepare a *full and analytical view of the whole law of the Church on slavery*, particularly in relation to the rights of the different grades of the ministry, as affected by slaveholding, so that all discordant views and discrepancies in administration might, if possible, be conclusively adjusted and settled, by authority of the General Conference; and the committee had this specific object in view in making their elaborate report. The report was adopted with great unanimity,—in fact, without a negative vote in the body. This report was looked to as settling the difficulties it was intended to remove, and was fully relied upon by the South, as securing all they desired in the premises." (*Methodism and Slavery*, p. 41.) This very explicit explanation leaves no room for mistaking the origin and object of the report and resolution; and certainly, so far as a declaratory act of the General Conference can go, must be conclusive in the premises.

This declaratory law of the Church—for such it clearly is—defining more fully than any other enactment, the exact rights and responsibilities of ministers with regard to slavery, is placed in a still clearer light, by a few brief extracts which we take from the Report itself, and here insert:—

"As emancipation, under such circumstances, (that is, in States where it is not practicable, so as to secure *the enjoyment of liberty to the freed slave*,) is not a requirement of Discipline, it cannot be made a condition of eligibility to office." Again, the Conference in the Report says, "an appeal to the policy and practice of the Church, for fifty years past, will show incontestibly, that whatever may have been the convictions of the Church, with regard to this great evil, the nature and tendency of the system of slavery, it has never insisted upon emancipation, in contravention of civil authority, and it, therefore, appears to be a well settled and long established principle, in the polity of the Church, that *no ecclesiastical* disabilities are intended to ensue, either to the ministers or members of the Church, *in those States* where the civil authority *forbids* emancipation." The General Conference of 1840 declares further, "that in the Discipline, we have two distinct classes of legislative provision, in relation to slavery, the one applying to owners of slaves, where emancipation is practicable, con-

sistently with the safety and interest of masters and slaves, and the other, where it is impracticable, without endangering such safety and these interests, on the part of both. In the latter case *no disability attaches on the ground of slavery*, because the disability attaching in other cases, is *here removed* by special provision of law." The same Report continues: "May not the principles and causes, giving birth to great moral and political systems or institutions, be regarded as evil, even essentially evil, in every *primary* aspect of the subject, without the implication of moral obliquity, on the part of those involuntarily connected with such systems and institutions, and providentially involved in their operation and consequences? May not a system of this kind, be jealously regarded, as in itself more or less inconsistent with natural right and moral rectitude, without the imputation of guilt, and derelict motive, in the instance of those, who without any choice or purpose of their own, are necessarily subjected to its influence and sway?"

And the concluding sentence which introduces the resolution we have before inserted, reads thus: "While the general rule on the subject of slavery, relating to those States whose laws admit of emancipation, and *permit the liberated slave to enjoy freedom*, should be firmly and constantly enforced, the *exception* to the general rule, applying to those States, where emancipation as defined above, is not *practicable*, should be *recognized and protected*, with equal *firmness and impartiality*."

We have been the more careful to ascertain the true character and bearings of this action of the General Conference of 1840, not less with reference to the case hereafter to be noticed, and the subject generally, than with regard to the case we have just been considering. And when it is understood that the primary object of that action was to define with exactness the rights and duties of ministers with regard to slavery, and that the South relied on it as affording the surest guaranty of protection in the enjoyment of Disciplinary rights, agreeably to an interpretation always received by themselves as the only practicable and consistent one, and in that act fully accredited by the General Conference, it is not at all astonishing that the total disregard of its authority in 1844, should have caused the Southern Delegates to feel that their personal security was essentially weakened, and the strong supports of the union greatly shaken. This declaratory interpretation of the law gave them all necessary protection, but if this were repudiated, they had none whatever; for, to reject the interpretation once officially given, was to deny them the right of the same interpretation, previously exercised for themselves without any authoritative declaration of the General Conference on the subject.

CHAPTER II.

From the conclusion of the Harding Case to the close of the General Conference of 1844, including the entire Proceedings in the Case of Bishop Andrew.

FROM the opening of the Session of General Conference, rumors were abroad of an intention to proceed in some way against Bishop Andrew, in consequence of his connection with slavery: and it was readily foreseen that the decision in Harding's case could hardly fail to exert an influence, both on the question of commencing such action and on the final disposition of the case if taken up by the Conference. For there were understood to be material points of resemblance between the two cases, and if the statutes of Maryland could afford no protection to a minister, it was difficult to see how the statutes of Georgia could protect the standing of a Bishop, when adjudged by the same tribunal. Accordingly after the Harding case was determined, those rumors became more rife, and assumed a more confident tone. The South, on seeing the Conservatives and Abolitionists coalesce in this case, brought themselves to believe that the *majority*, and not the *law*, exercised the only protective or punitive power of the Church. The Abolition wing of the Conference felt both strengthened and emboldened by the new alliance; while the "middle men" found themselves fully committed by their action in sustaining the Baltimore Conference, to carry out consistently the principles involved in that case, in any other that might come before them. The aged and wise saw and felt the perilousness of the position in which the Conference was placed: the North urged them further as the only means of saving New England; the South entreated them to stay their hand unless they wished to consummate the ruin of the Southern Church, already but too successfully begun. While the zealous of the party in the ascendant—so decisively victorious in the recent contest—were arranging plans for a new attack and rallying for a bolder charge, some of the sage and devout lovers of peace and unity, without distinction of party, gave themselves to counsel, to prayer and serious inquiry, hoping to devise some means to avert the threatening storm. In this commendable spirit two eminent and amiable men, Dr. W. Capers of the South and Dr. S. Olin of the North, came forward in the General Con-

sference, on the 14th May, and offered jointly the following resolution:—

“In view of the distracting agitation which has so long prevailed on the subject of slavery and abolition, and especially the difficulties under which we labor in the present General Conference, on account of the relative position of our brethren North and South on this perplexing question; therefore,

“*Resolved*, That a committee of three from the North and three from the South, be appointed to confer with the Bishops, and report within two days as to the possibility of adopting some plan, and what, for the permanent pacification of the Church.”

Immediately on the offering of this resolution, the *middle-men* or Conservatives claimed to be recognized as a distinct division or class in the Church and Conference, by demanding a representation in the proposed committee. But as only two points were named in the resolution, and two opposing principles, and not three, were involved in the previous debates and action of the Conference—the right to hold slaves according to the provisions of the Discipline, and the right of enforcing *abolition*, as in the case of Harding, the claim was seen to be groundless; and accordingly the committee was taken from the South and from the *whole* North—Dr. Capers, of S. C., Dr. Winans, of Mi., and Mr. Early, of Va., representing the former, and Dr. Olin and Mr. Crandle, of New England, and Mr. Hamline, of Ohio, the latter.

The discussion had pending this resolution, is very important as showing the true state of things to have been, at that time, very different from that in which they are commonly represented. The popular presentation of the matter is, that all the difficulty, and finally the division, had sole reference to the case of Bishop Andrew, and but for him there had been no serious controversy in the General Conference. The remarks made on that occasion show, that in the opinion of the prominent speakers, the *Rubicon* was passed before the case of Bishop Andrew was taken up at all. We shall, therefore, make a few quotations from those speeches, as being calculated to reflect important light on this part of our history. We quote the following remarks from the speech of Dr. Olin:—

He said “he had feared for these two or three days that, though possibly they might escape the disasters that threatened them, it was not probable. He had seen the cloud gathering, so dark that it seemed to him there was no hope left for them unless God should give them hope. It might be from his relation to both extremities that, inferior as might be his means of forming conclusions on other topics, he had some advantages on this. And from an intimate acquaintance with the feelings

of his brethren in the work he saw little ground of encouragement to hope. It appears to me (he continued) that we stand committed on this question by our principles and views of policy, and neither of us dare move a step from our position. Let us keep away from the controversy until brethren from opposite sides have come together. I confess I turn away from it with sorrow, and a deep feeling of apprehension that the difficulties that are upon us now threaten to be unmanageable. I feel it in my heart, and never felt on any subject as I do on this. I may take it for granted that we speak as opponents here. I have had no part in this controversy. It has pleased God that I should be far away, or laid upon a bed of sickness. I have my opinions and attachments, but I am committed by no act of mine to either side; and I will take it on me to say freely that I do not see how Northern men can yield their ground, or Southern men give up theirs. I do indeed believe, that if our affairs remain in their present position, and this General Conference do not speak out clearly and distinctly on the subject, however unpalatable it may be, they could not go home under this distracting question without a certainty of breaking up their Conferences. I have been to eight or ten of the Northern Conferences, and spoken freely with men of every class, and firmly believe, that, with the fewest exceptions, they are influenced by the most ardent and the strongest desire to maintain the Discipline of our Church. Will the Southern men believe me in this—when I say I am sincere, and well informed on the subject? The men who stand here as Abolitionists are as ardently attached to Methodist Episcopacy as you all. I believe it in my heart. Your Northern brethren, who seem to you to be arrayed in a hostile attitude, have suffered a great deal before they have taken their position, and they come up here distressed beyond measure, and disposed, if they believed they could, without destruction and ruin to the Church, to make concession. It may be that both parties will consent to come together and talk over the matter fairly, and unbosom themselves, and speak all that is in their hearts; and as lovers of Christ keep out passion and prejudice, and with much prayer call down the Holy Spirit upon their deliberations, and feeling the dire necessity that oppresses both parties, they will at least endeavor to adopt some plan of pacification, that if they go away it may not be without hope of meeting again as brethren. I look to this measure with desire rather than with hope. With regard to our Southern brethren, and I hold that on this question at least, I may speak with some confidence—that if they concede what the Northern brethren wish—if they concede that holding slaves is incompatible with holding their ministry—they may as well go to the Rocky Mountains as to their own

sunny plains. The people would not bear it. They feel shut up to their principles on this point. They love the cause, and would serve God in their work. I believe there is not a man among them, that would not make every sacrifice, and even die, if thereby they could heal this division. If their difficulties were unmanageable, let their spirit be right. If we must part, let us meet and pour out our tears together; and let us not give up until we have tried. I came into this Conference yesterday morning to offer another resolution. It was that we should suspend, now that the Sabbath had intervened, and shed its calmness and quiet over our agitated spirits, that we should suspend our duties for one day, and devote it to fasting and prayer, that God might help them, if he would, that, if they had not union, they might have peace. This resolution partakes of the same spirit. I cannot speak on this subject without deep emotion. If we push our principles so far as to break up the connection, this may be the last time we may meet. I fear it! I fear it! I see no way of escape."

Dr. Durbin said: "He could never forget the scene before him this morning. Dr. Olin had said that he scarcely indulged the hope, though he felt a strong desire, that the measure proposed would be successful. For himself, he thought he could discern light, notwithstanding the darkness that hung around the question; and he felt not only a *desire*, but a strong *hope*, that we should yet be delivered from the dangers which impended over our heads. Yes, he clung to the hope of the continued unity of the Church. Abraham, in great difficulties, believed in hope against hope, and yet most gloriously realized his hope, and became the father of many nations. He said, he saw ground for this hope in the tenderness of spirit which had been manifested so generally since the introduction of the resolution; and he felt now, as he had felt since his arrival in the city, the most confident assurance that brethren of all parties would sacrifice every thing, but their ulterior principles, for the continued unity of the Church."

Mr. Crandle, of New England, said: "He was as much for conciliation as any man, and did not wish to disturb the good feeling that at present existed in the Conference. But there was a dark shade of difference between the brethren of the two extremes. He supposed he should be taken as one standing on the extreme. As such they were standing on a volcano, which might, at any moment, destroy them. But what was the pretext for this reform movement? Why, there was slavery in the Church, and the Church tolerated it. And they must meet it. But had the North shown any disposition for division? Not at all. He did not know a man in the North that desired division. He hoped that before they took any action in the matter they would understand it."

Mr. Early, of Virginia, remarked "on the spirit pervading the Conference, and the spirit that he trusted would pervade the committee—the spirit of prayer, love, and forbearance. He would assure the Conference that the South were prepared to make any concessions in the same spirit that they could, without affecting their essential principles."

Dr. Smith, of Virginia, said: "The South does not desire disunion. Come when it may it shall be forced upon us."

These brief quotations indicate with sufficient clearness, the extremely critical posture of affairs at that time; and they also serve as an index to the fears, convictions, and spirit of the parties. And they show us that the South entertained the most determined aversion to separation.

Nearly the last hope of continued union now hung suspended on the doubtful result of the committee's deliberations; and their report was awaited with painful solicitude. On the 16th, the time their report was expected, Bishop Soule asked in their behalf for longer time; and on the 18th, he reported that the committee "had been unable to agree upon any plan of compromise to reconcile the views of the Northern and Southern Conferences."

The failure of the attempt at compromise, was, of course, the signal for pushing the measures so energetically commenced to the ulterior point. Accordingly on the 20th, Mr. Collins, of Baltimore, the active advocate in opposition to Harding, offered the following preamble and resolution, which were adopted:—

"*Whereas*, it is currently reported and generally understood, that one of the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church has become connected with slavery; and *whereas*, it is due to the General Conference to have a proper understanding of the matter: therefore,

"*Resolved*, That the Committee on the Episcopacy be instructed to ascertain the facts in the case, and report the result of their investigation to this body to-morrow morning."

In obedience to the instruction given in this resolution, on the 21st Dr. Paine, chairman of the Committee on Episcopacy, submitted to the Conference the following report:—

"The Committee on Episcopacy, to whom was referred a resolution, submitted yesterday, instructing them to inquire whether any one of the Superintendents is connected with slavery, presented their report on the subject.

"The committee had ascertained, previous to the reference of the resolution, that Bishop Andrew is connected with slavery, and had obtained an interview with him on the subject; and having requested him to state the whole facts in the premises, they presented a written communication from him in relation to this matter, and asked leave to offer it as his statement and explanation of the case.

“*To the Committee on Episcopacy:*

“Dear Brethren—In reply to your inquiry, I submit the following statement of all the facts bearing on my connection with slavery. Several years since an old lady, of Augusta, Georgia, bequeathed to me a mulatto girl, in trust, that I should take care of her until she should be 19 years of age; that *with her consent*, I should then send her to Liberia; and that in case of her refusal, I should keep her, and make her as free as the laws of the State of Georgia would permit. When the time arrived, she refused to go to Liberia, and of her own choice remains *legally* my slave, although I derive no pecuniary advantage from her, she continuing to live in her own house on my lot; and has been and still is at perfect liberty to go to a free State at her pleasure; but the laws of the State will not permit her emancipation, nor admit such deed of emancipation to record, and she refuses to leave the State. In her case, therefore, I have been made a slaveholder legally, but not with my own consent.

“2ndly. About five years since the mother of my former wife left to her daughter, *not to me*, a negro boy; and as my wife died without a will more than two years since, by the laws of the State he becomes legally my property. In this case, as in the former, emancipation is impracticable in the State; but he shall be at liberty to leave the State whenever I shall be satisfied that he is prepared to provide for himself, or I can have sufficient security that he will be protected and provided for in the place to which he may go.

“3rdly. In the month of January last I married my present wife, she being at the time possessed of slaves, inherited from her former husband's estate, and belonging to *her*. Shortly after my marriage, being unwilling to become their owner, regarding them as strictly hers, and the law not permitting their emancipation, I secured them to her by a deed of trust.

“It will be obvious to you, from the above statement of facts, that I have neither bought nor sold a slave; that in the only circumstances in which I am legally a slaveholder, emancipation is impracticable. As to the servants owned by my wife, I have no legal responsibility in the premises, nor could my wife emancipate them did she desire to do so. I have thus plainly stated all the facts in the case, and submit the statement for the consideration of the General Conference.

Yours respectfully, (Signed) JAMES O. ANDREW.’

“All which is respectfully submitted.

(Signed)

ROBERT PAINE,

Chairman of Committee on Episcopacy.”

Mr. Collins, who had taken the lead in this as in the former prosecution, moved that the report be laid on the table, and

made the special order for the next day; assigning as his reason for this motion, that there was to be a meeting of the *Northern Delegates* that afternoon, to concert, as was distinctly understood, plans of action in the prosecution. This announcement was immediately followed by a call for a meeting of the *Southern Delegates* on the same afternoon. It was thus clearly seen that the parties were organizing and arranging their plans and forces—the one for attack, the other for defence, in the approaching contest.

At this stage of the business, a note was received from Dr. Bond—not a member of the Conference—followed by a verbal statement from him, the purport of which was, that a report was abroad, that the Northern members had formed a plan for forcing the South into secession, and that he had been given as authority. He denied all knowledge of such a plan, and did not believe any thing of the kind existed. Dr. Bangs said that he too had heard a report, that the purpose had been avowed to adopt measures that would compel Bishop Andrew to resign, and the South to secede, and then seize on the Church property. He could not believe it.

Dr. Smith said, “The point at issue was this. It had been stated over and over again, in terms that led to the conviction that it was the purpose of many in the Conference to pursue measures which must necessarily result in a division, and that, in declaring their adhesion to these measures, he would say they had used language that justly entitled them to a disclaimer.”

On the next day, (the 22d of May,) Mr. Griffith, the co-adjutor of Mr. Collins in the former case, and the member who spoke so contemptuously of the laws of Maryland, called up the report in the case of Bishop Andrew, and offered the following preamble and resolution:

“Whereas, the Rev. James O. Andrew, one of the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, has become connected with slavery, as communicated in his statement in reply to the inquiry of the Committee on Episcopacy, which reply is embodied in their report of yesterday; and whereas, it has been, from the origin of said Church, a settled policy and invariable usage to elect no person to the office of Bishop, who was embarrassed with this ‘great evil,’ as under such circumstances it would be impossible for a Bishop to exercise the functions and perform the duties assigned to a general superintendent with acceptance in that large portion of his charge in which slavery does not exist; and whereas, Bishop Andrew himself was nominated by our brethren of the slaveholding States, and elected by the General Conference of 1832, as a candidate who, though living amidst a slaveholding population, was nevertheless free from all

personal connection with slavery; and whereas, this is of all periods in our history as a Church, the one least favorable to such an innovation upon the practice and usage of Methodism, as to confide a part of the itinerant general superintendency to a slaveholder; therefore,

“Resolved, That the Rev. James O. Andrew be and he is hereby affectionately requested to resign his office as one of the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church.”

Mr. Griffith made a speech in support of his resolution, in which are found some doctrines not commonly heard on the floor of the General Conference, and certainly until then never recognized as orthodox. A Bishop he declared to be simply an officer of the General Conference—not of the Church at large—and his election was not for life or good behavior, but during the pleasure of the General Conference. The following are a few of his remarks on that occasion:—

“A Bishop among us is therefore *only an officer of the General Conference, created for special purposes, and for no other than the purposes specified.* If we look at the origin of its introduction, we shall clearly perceive this to be the case. The venerable John Wesley who was never able to disabuse his own gigantic mind of his educational prejudices, perhaps to the day of his death, thought to serve the American Churches with a *high officer* in virtue of his own appointment. What said the venerable Asbury—that man of God to whom Methodism on this continent, is more deeply indebted than to any other man who has ever lived, or perhaps ever will live? He declined to receive that office by the appointment of John Wesley. He refused to accept it unless the General Conference, then in session in the city of Baltimore, in 1784—the Christmas Conference—should elect him. It is matter of history which no man can call in question. He was elected by the General Conference, and constituted the highest officer—the executive officer of the General Conference.”

Again, he said, “They never intended, we say, to constitute him [the Bishop] an officer for life; but they reserved to themselves as Annual Conferences power even to change every feature of the system of government—to change every thing pertaining to the character of the Church, save the doctrines. That alone is absolutely prohibited. What are we here consulting about? What are we here proposing to accomplish and effect? Is it, sir, to try a Bishop on an impeachment for immoral conduct? No, sir. We are here concerned exclusively with an *officer of the General Conference*, and the question comes up whether this General Conference, to whom the Annual Conferences have given full power, not only to perpetuate their own existence, but to make all rules and regulations for the government

of the Church, and to supervise and carry on the great object of the General Association for spreading Scriptural truth and holiness through these lands; whether the General Conference, constituted under such circumstances, has power to regulate *her own officers*—that's the question; and whether, when once she selects an officer, no change in his condition, no change in his situation, no embarrassment with which he may choose to involve himself, can be touched. No, sir; they have full authority to regulate their *own officers*, to provide for any exigency which may operate as a barrier in the way of the accomplishment of the objects and purposes for which the officers were chosen.”*

Mr. Griffith chiefly asserted the *right* of the General Conference to depose a Bishop by this indirect proceeding, upon the ground that he was their officer, the creature of their power, created to do and suffer their will. After Bishop Soule had delivered a very impressive address, admonishing the Conference to moderation and gentleness, Mr. Sandford spoke in support of the resolution, advocating it on the ground of *expediency* alone, and basing that expediency alone on the consequences which he said must result from a failure to deal with Bishop Andrew for his connection with slavery. “In the majority of the Conferences that compose this vast body,” said he, “if something be not done to remove the evil connected with the superintendency of Bishop Andrew out of the way, we cannot *possibly avoid convulsions*, and the loss of very large numbers of our members, and give opportunity to our enemies to exert a destructive influence within the ranks of our own community. This is clear and certain, and does not admit of a single doubt.”

* Novel as were Mr. Griffith's doctrines to most of his hearers—and unfortunately infectious as novel with the majority—they were not new to himself. More than twenty years before that period, he had resolutely arrayed himself, with what was then called the Radical Party, in opposition to the power of the Bishops as exercised according to the Discipline in the appointment of presiding elders. And in a pamphlet published by him (and three others) against Bishops McKendree and Soule on this subject, he uses nearly the same language quoted from his speech, in adverting to the same circumstance with reference to Bishop Asbury. He there says, “A scrupulous and precise adherence to the minutiae of the present *mode* of appointing presiding elders, is so far from being essential to Methodism, that in its *first* and *purest* days, there were no presiding elders, and to this day there are none in our sister connection in Europe: and we believe it is a fact, that Mr. Asbury himself, when appointed by Mr. Wesley a general superintendent, *or a general presiding elder*, refused to serve in that office until he was elected by the free suffrages of his brethren in Conference.” In his distrust and suspicion of the Episcopacy, Mr. Griffith's mind seems to have undergone little change, or none, since he wrote, in July, 1824, to warn the church against Episcopal prerogative, as exercised by Bishop McKendree. He then said, “Remember the tenacious grasp with which power is held, when once acquired. Its march is ever onward, and its tremendous tendency is to accumulation.” But on another point he seems to have varied a little since 1824. He then said that a man was not a Bishop who had been elected to the episcopal office by the General Conference, because he was not ordained, but now tells us that episcopal authority is “not at all” derived from episcopal ordination.

Dr. Winans replied, showing that Bishop Andrew was protected by the law of the Church in what he had done,—that he was a slaveholder involuntarily, &c. The doctrine of *expediency* he strongly opposed, by showing what he said must be its practical results. On this subject he said:—

“But, sir, the main point relied upon in this matter is, the expediency of the course contemplated. Expediency! Such a state of things has been gotten up in the North and in the West as renders it necessary for Bishop Andrew to retire from the office of the superintendency, if we would preserve the union of the Church. Sir, I will meet this by another argument on expediency. By the vote contemplated by this body, and solicited by this resolution, you will render it expedient; nay, more, you render it indispensable; nay, more, you render it *uncontrollably necessary* that a large portion of the Church—and permit me to add, a portion always conformed in their views and practices to the Discipline of the Church—I say that by this vote you render it indispensably, aye, uncontrollably necessary, that that portion of the Church should ———. I dread to pronounce the word, but you understand me. Yes, sir, you create an uncontrollable necessity that there should be a disconnection of that large portion of the Church from your body. It is not because there are prejudices waked up by unceasing agitation year after year, in opposition to the spirit and language of the Discipline; but it arises out of the established laws of society, from a state of things that is under the control of political and civil government, which no minister of the gospel can control or influence in the smallest degree. If you pass this action in the mildest form in which you can approach the Bishop, you will throw every minister in the South *hors du combat*; you will cut us off from all connection with masters and servants, and will leave us no option—God is my witness that I speak with all sincerity of purpose toward you—but to be disconnected with your body. If such necessity exists on your part to drive this man from his office, we re-assert that this must be the result of your action in the matter. We have no will, no choice in this thing. It comes upon us as destiny; it comes with overwhelming force, and all we can do is to submit to it. Let this then pass before you, and then give such weight as you think fitting to the argument for expediency embraced in the preamble to this resolution, and let that determine your vote in this matter. There may come a time when your hearts will bleed at the recollection of having cut off from your body—for we will never go voluntarily—as firm, and good friends, and as honest in our attachment to Discipline, as any other portion of the Church.”

Here we cannot fail to remark, that at the very commence-

ment of this debate it was assumed by Northern speakers that unless the Conference proceeded against Bishop Andrew, vast numbers, and whole Conferences would abandon the Church in the North, and by Southern speakers as positively assumed, that if they did so proceed, the South would be inevitably compelled to separate.

Mr. Bowen, of Oneida Conference, followed, strongly vindicating *expediency* as a proper rule of action in the case, even though the Bishop's connection might be throughout entirely involuntary. He alluded to division and secession, which he deprecated, but still thought it a less evil than *schism*, or division and contention in the Church.

Dr. Pierce, of Georgia, spoke with great energy against the doctrine of *expediency*, as productive of endless mischiefs, and if practiced on in this case, of great injury, if not ruin to the South. With the majority it was highly expedient to do what it was ruinous on the part of the minority to suffer. He closed his remarks by saying:—

“Finally, I say, pass this resolution, and the whole of the Southern States are hurled into confusion at once, and the brother that would lie down to be trampled upon by such an act of this body, would be regarded as unworthy the office he held, and unworthy to preach the gospel of Jesus. I am against the resolution, and am glad to make it known that I am against it on principles pure as those that kindle the glory of high heaven—not because I am a pro-slavery man, but because God did not call me to legislate on these matters.”

Mr. J. C. Berryman spoke to the effect that he should vote with his eye on the Discipline, and go only as far as he had law. The preamble and resolution he thought not authorized by the Discipline, and should therefore oppose their passage.

Mr. Coleman said, “Southern brethren knew little of the labors of the Northern men to secure *their* comfort and safety. Give them a slaveholding Bishop, and they make the whole North an arena of gunpowder, and the Bishop a *fire-brand in the midst*.”

Dr. Smith questioned the fact of Northern men laboring for the good of the South, as stated by Mr. Coleman, against abolitionism.

Mr. Stringfield opposed the resolution on two grounds; first, because it asked the Bishop to degrade himself, whereas, if he had offended *they* ought to define the crime and inflict the penalty. Here they proposed to award that the Bishop ought to be deposed, and then make him inflict the penalty by resigning. Secondly, since expediency was the order of the day, he opposed the measure on the ground of expediency. It was highly inexpedient for him to resign; for if they *shuffled*

him out they must put some one in his place; that one of course would not be from the South, and the Northerner they might put into the place made vacant by ejecting Bishop Andrew, would be as unacceptable at the South, as Bishop Andrew *could* be at the North.

Mr. Crowder, of Virginia, again met the *expediency* doctrine, and labored to show that this expediency did not concern Christian character, or obedience to the requirements of the Discipline; for in these the Bishop was blameless, by the showing of those who advocated the resolution; but it was a state, a temper of the public mind in the North, superinduced by the spirit of abolitionism, which must needs condemn a man who is justified by the law of our common Christianity and the law of the Discipline.

Mr. Spencer, of Pittsburgh Conference, addressed the Conference. The most remarkable points in his speech are these. He contended that to punish Bishop Andrew for an act not against law at the time it occurred, was not in the nature of *ex post facto* action, because the proceeding was a *present* action to counteract the effects of past conduct not covered by the law. [Upon this construction it is difficult to conceive of the possibility of *ex post facto* action under any circumstances.] Another of his points is the doctrine of expediency again, which he states in the following strong terms:—

“But, sir, much is said of expediency. Well, let us look at *expediency*. It is alleged that it would be a dreadful thing to pass the resolution before us, as a matter of expediency. This is a grave subject. But is not expediency at the foundation of many grave and important subjects? Mr. President, how did you and your colleagues get into the episcopal office? Expediency put you there, expediency keeps you there, and when expediency requires it you shall be removed from your seats—yes, every one of you. Expediency is the foundation of our episcopacy. Nay more, it is the very basis of Methodism.”

He remarks further, that if Bishop Andrew’s “ministerial and moral character were *as immaculate as an angel in heaven*, as a slaveholder he is utterly unqualified to discharge the functions of the episcopal office in the greater part of our work; and ought therefore to resign or be deposed.”

On the 23rd, Dr. Bangs took the floor. He insisted that slavery in the episcopacy was contrary to Methodist usage, as stated in the preamble, because no Bishop of the Church had heretofore held slaves. He also admitted that Bishop Andrew’s connection with slavery was “against his will,” in the first and second instances named by the Bishop in his communication to the Committee on the Episcopacy, and intimated that for these he ought not to be censured; “But,” said Dr. B., “will

any one avow that he was not a free agent when he connected himself with this lady? No one will avow that. He therefore acted *imprudently*.”*

After some personal conversation of an explanatory character, in which Dr. Bangs, Dr. Capers, Mr. Davis, and Mr. Pickering were concerned, the following was offered as a substitute for the preamble and resolution before the Conference:—

“Whereas, the Discipline of our Church forbids the doing any thing calculated to destroy our itinerant general superintendency; and whereas Bishop Andrew has become connected with slavery by marriage and otherwise, and this act having drawn after it circumstances which in the estimation of the General Conference will greatly embarrass the exercise of his office as an itinerant general superintendent, if not in some places entirely prevent it; therefore,

Resolved, That it is the sense of this General Conference that he desist from the exercise of this office so long as this impediment remains. [Signed] J. B. FINLEY,

J. M. TRIMBLE.”

Mr. Finley very briefly stated his reasons for offering the substitute. He thought it would meet the case better than the original resolution; it would not depose Bishop Andrew, but leave him still a Bishop, with only a wish of Conference expressed that he should cease to exercise the functions of his office while the present incumbrance remained. He did not wish Bishop Andrew to resign, &c.

Dr. Olin, of New York Conference, spoke in favor of the substitute as preferable to the original resolution. He said “he could not affirm directly, or by implication, that the Discipline is averse to the election of a slaveholder to the office of Bishop,” and he thought this idea was conveyed in the preamble, when it was affirmed that the holding of slaves by a Bishop, is contrary to the settled “policy and usage” of the Church. *Usage* conveyed in some sense the idea of common law, but we had no law against a Bishop holding slaves. The mere fact that non-slaveholding candidates had received a majority of votes, did not amount to usage in any binding or authoritative sense. The office of President of the United States had been filled forty-three years by slaveholders, and but twelve by Northern

* Dr. Bangs was not alone in fixing Bishop Andrew’s offence in the matter of his marriage. Mr. Spencer, from whose speech we have just quoted, alluded to the subject in no very liberal spirit, or dignified language, inquiring in a vein of scorching irony, whether it was to be supposed that the Bishop had fallen so desperately in love that he was obliged to marry—whether a Bishop “old enough to be a grandfather had fallen into a *chicken fit*,” &c. It is evident, if he married at all, he must either be governed in a selection by his own judgment and affections, or he must submit his judgment, taste, and attachments to the control of his Northern brethren, and like an Eastern monarch, wed by proxy, and from motives of interest and popularity.

statesmen, but this would not authorize the assertion that "the settled policy and usage of the government was to elect slaveholding Presidents." To give some idea of the general character of Dr. Olin's remarks, we insert the following extracts from his speech, though not in exact consecutive order:—

"I believe we are all prepared to recognize the right of Southern brethren to hold slaves under the provisions of the Discipline. We shall acknowledge and guaranty the entire of the privileges and immunities of all parties in the Church. I here declare, that if a remedy should be proposed that would trench on the constitutional claims of Southern ministers, I would not, to save the Church from any possible calamity, violate this great charter of our rights. I am glad of the opportunity of saying, that no man, who is a Methodist, and deserves a place among us, can call in question here any rights secured by our charter. I do not say that he may not be a very honest, or a very pious man, who doubts the compatibility of slaveholding on the conditions of the Discipline, with the ministerial office; but in this he is not a Methodist. He may be a very *good man*, but a very *bad Methodist*; and if such a man doubts if the Church will reform, or is too impatient of delay, let him, as I would in his place, do as our friends in New England did last year, go to some other Church, or set up one for himself.

"Not only is holding slaves, on the conditions and under the restrictions of the Discipline, no disqualification for the ministerial office; but I will go a little farther, and say, that slaveholding is not constitutionally a forfeiture of a man's right, if he may be said to have one, to the office of a Bishop. The Church, spread out through all the land, will always determine for itself what are disqualifications and what are not, and it has a perfect right to determine whether slaveholding, or abolitionism, or any other fact, shall be taken into consideration in its elections.

"These are my principles. I have never doubted with regard to them. I will add, that I can never give a vote which does violence to my sentiments in regard to the religious aspect of the subject. I here declare, that, if I ever saw the graces of the Christian ministry displayed, or its virtues developed, it has been among slaveholders. I wish here to divest myself of what, to some, may seem an advantage that does not belong to me. I would not conceal—I avow that I was a slaveholder, and a minister at the South, and I never dreamed that my right to the ministry was questionable, or that in the sight of God I was less fitted to preach the gospel on that account. And if the state of my health had not driven me away from that region, I should probably have been a slaveholder to this

day. In this day of reform, and manifold suggestions, I go further, and say, that, if by a vote of this General Conference, you might call in question the right of our Southern brethren to the ministry, and make their claim to the sacred office dependent on their giving immediate freedom to their slaves, I do not think that that would be a blessing to the slaves, or to the Church. I do not believe the slave fares worse for having a christian master, and I think the preachers may have more of public confidence on our present plan. I know these opinions may by some be regarded as unsound, and I make them not because they have any special value or novelty, but because I profess to speak my sentiments freely.

“With regard to the particular case before us, I feel constrained to make one or two remarks. If ever there was a man worthy to fill the episcopal office by his disinterestedness, his love of the Church, his ardent, melting sympathy for all the interests of humanity, but above all, for his uncompromising and unreserved advocacy of the interest of the slave—if these are qualifications for the office of a Bishop, then James O. Andrew is pre-eminently fitted to hold that office. I know him well. He was the friend of my youth, and although by his experience and his position fitted to be a father, yet he made me a brother, and no man has more fully shared my sympathies, or more intimately known my heart for these twenty years. His house has been my home, on his bed have I lain in sickness, and he, with his sainted wife now in heaven, has been my comforter and nurse. No question under heaven could have presented itself so painfully oppressive to my feelings as the one now before us. If I had a hundred votes, and Bishop Andrew were not pressed by the difficulties which now rest upon him, without any wrong intention on his part I am sure, he is the man to whom I would give them all. I know no man who has been so bold an advocate for the interest of the slaves, and when I have been constrained to refrain from saying what perhaps I should have said, I have heard him at camp meetings and on other public occasions call fearlessly on masters to see to the spiritual and temporal interests of their slaves, as a high christian duty. Excepting one honored brother, whose name will hereafter be recorded as one of the greatest benefactors of the African race, I know of no man who has done so much for the slave as Bishop Andrew.”

“I know the difficulties of the South. I know the excitement that is likely to prevail among the people there. Yet allowing our worst fears all to be realized, the South will have this advantage over us—the Southern Conferences are likely in any event to harmonize among themselves—they will form a compact body. In our Northern Conferences this will be

impossible in the present state of things. They cannot bring their whole people to act together on one common ground; stations and circuits will be so weakened and broken as in many instances to be unable to sustain their ministry. I speak on this point in accordance with the conviction of my own judgment, after having travelled three thousand miles through the New England and New York Conferences, that if some action is not had on this subject calculated to hold out hope—to impart a measure of satisfaction to the people—there will be distractions and divisions ruinous to souls, and fatal to the permanent interests of the Church.

“I feel, sir, that if this great difficulty shall result in separation from our Southern brethren, we lose not our right hand merely, but our very hearts’ blood. Over such an event I should not cease to pour out my prayers and tears as over a grievous and unmitigated calamity. It was in that part of our Zion that God for Christ’s sake converted my soul. There I first entered on the christian ministry. From thence come the beloved, honored brethren, who now surround me, with whom and among whom I have labored, and suffered, and rejoiced, and seen the doings of the right hand of the Son of God. If the day shall come when we must be separated by lines of demarkation, I shall yet think often of those beyond with the kindest, warmest feelings of an honest christian heart. But, sir, I will yet trust that we may put far off this evil day. If we can pass such a measure as will shield our principles from all infringement—if we can send forth such a measure as will neither injure nor justly offend the South—as shall neither censure nor dishonor Bishop Andrew, and yet shall meet the pressing wants of the Church, and above all, if Almighty God shall be pleased to help by pouring out his Spirit upon us, we may yet avoid the rock on which we now seem but too likely to split.”

Mr. Drake, of Mississippi, opposed the substitute. He thought in spirit and principle, it was no better than the original. A Bishop, he said, holds his office for life or good behavior, and he believed this was the universal understanding. “Now to say that we can deprive a Bishop of his office, and yet not censure him—that we can depose, and yet leave his episcopal robe unstained—is, to my mind, absurd in the extreme.” “According to their own showing, they cannot punish Bishop Andrew without committing an extra-judicial act. Nor can this course be pursued, and the union of the Church be preserved.” He said the South did not expect to become seceders, but to abide by the Discipline, and even a majority of the members had no right to drive them from it. If this concession were made to the North it would not satisfy them. He

had enquired of them and the response was, that with this they would be satisfied AT PRESENT. Probably at next General Conference it would be necessary to pursue a similar course with Presiding Elders. He concluded by suggesting the following as better suiting the case, and without any violation of the Discipline:

“Whereas, there have been found difficulties of a serious nature in the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church exercising a general superintendency; therefore,

“*Resolved*, That the General Conference recommend the episcopacy to assign to each Superintendent his sphere of labor for the next four years.”

This proposition, not being in order, was offered as a suggestion, and no action was had on it.

Mr. Slicer, of Baltimore, said he belonged to the class called Conservatives, and would go for the substitute. It would not quite suit the extremes North or South, but he thought it would suit the case and the great body of the Church between New England and Virginia, and West to the Mississippi. He thought the elected delegates in the General Conference had a right to have a slaveholding Bishop, if they chose to elect one, but did not think that they would have one until they did so choose to elect him. “Bishop Andrew had not infringed the Discipline, but he had offended against the great law of *expediency*.”

Mr. Crandle, of New England, did not quite approve either resolution, but thought there was a disposition to meet the South on some middle ground. He had intended to vote for the substitute until he heard the speech of the brother from Mississippi, (Mr. Drake.) He took exception to a remark of Dr. Olin—that the *constitution* granted Southern ministers the right of holding slaves, without prejudice to their official standing. He admitted that the *statute law* of the Church allowed this right, but not the constitution. (Dr. Olin explained that this was in substance his meaning.)

Mr. Cass, of New Hampshire, said: “Mr. President, if I understand the subject now under consideration, it is this:—Is it expedient for this Conference to suspend Bishop Andrew from his office on account of his being a slaveholder, until such time as he shall be free from this embarrassment? The reason assigned why such action should be had is, that a large majority of the Church are opposed to having a slaveholder for a Bishop. Now, sir, I hold if they are wrong, and the Bishop is right, no action should be had against him in the premises. This, then, is the question to be settled. Dr. Olin has said that the Bishop has done no wrong; but, with all due deference, I must beg leave to dissent from his opinion in this matter.

“Sir, is there no moral wrong in being a slaveholder? A

portion of the North believe slaveholding to be a moral wrong. We have nothing to do with slavery in the abstract: but we believe that slavery, as it exists in these United States, and in the Methodist Episcopal Church, is morally wrong.

“But, leaving this out of the question for the present, is there no wrong in Bishop Andrew becoming a slaveholder, and thereby disturbing the peace of the Church; and also bringing this dark cloud over us, and this trouble upon us, which has pained our hearts and detained us here for days? when he has brought this evil into existence by his voluntary act, with his eyes open? Sir, I think there must be a wrong in this.

“Dr. Olin has said, that the resolution now before us should be so modified as that Bishop Andrew will not be censured. Sir, I hold there should be no privileged order in the Methodist Episcopal Church: if he has done wrong, he ought to be censured. As much as I respect the office of Bishop, and the men who fill it, they are amenable to justice if they do wrong as much as I am in my humble relation in the Church; and with as much greater responsibility as their station is above mine. They are the very last men who should not be censured, if in the wrong. Mark this, sir, whenever there is a privileged order in the Methodist Episcopal Church, the glory will have departed. Let this not be—no, never.

“Dr. Olin says, that slaveholding does not disqualify any man for the ministry, provided he live in a slaveholding State; and that the constitution of the Methodist Church sustains him in his position, and those who differ from him in opinion are bad Methodists; and if they persist in these courses, they ought to follow the example of those who have seceded from the Methodist Episcopal Church. Sir, by this one stroke he has severed four Conferences from the Methodist Episcopal Church. I do not, however, think he intended to do it. But it was done with his zeal to hold on to the South, which, by the way, he appears to have some sympathy, if not partiality for, as he has been a slaveholder, and never thought it was any thing against his ministerial character.

“The South say, if Bishop Andrew is suspended, the line of division will be drawn between the North and South, and that when they say this they speak the mind of the whole South. Sir, how do they know this fact? Have they taken a vote in all their Annual Conferences? or, have they had a convention to deliberate on this matter?

“They calculate to claim that they are the Church and the North will be the seceders. This is not the first time we have heard of nullification, or that which is equivalent, (in the Church and State,) from the South; but the world stands yet, and I believe it will not be moved from its foundations if the

resolution before us should pass. These threats have their meaning, which is perfectly understood by the North."

May 24th. Mr. G. F. Pierce, of Georgia, spoke against the resolution, in an animated speech of some length, from which we make the following extract:—

"Sir, there has been, in every speech which has been made on the other side of the question, a false issue attempted. Whatever may be affirmed of expediency, and the disqualification of Bishop Andrew for the office of general superintendent, in view of circumstances over which it is declared brethren have no control, it is not to be forgotten or disguised that this is not an abstract, but a practical question, that it involves the constitutional rights and equality of privileges belonging to Southern ministers. It is a practical question, too, which cannot be set off from its connection with the past, and its bearings on the future. It is part and parcel of a system, slowly developed it may be, yet obvious in its designs and unwearied in its operation, to deprive Southern ministers of their rights, and to disfranchise the whole Southern Church. You cannot take the question out of its relations. It cannot be made to stand as brethren have tried to make it stand, isolated and alone. If there had been no memorials on your table, praying for the establishment of a law of proscription—if there had not been declared over and over again a settled purpose, if not in unequivocal terms, yet in unequivocal acts, to work out the destruction of this evil, and free the episcopacy and the Church itself from this evil, the question before us would be different in its aspects, and the action of the South in regard to it might be modified accordingly. I beg this Conference to consider this question in the light of its connection with the previous action in the case of the appeal from the Baltimore Conference. Sir, the preposterous doctrine was asserted in that Conference that its purposes and usages are paramount to the law of the land, and the doctrine of that Conference has been affirmed here. Sir, the action of this Conference on the subject has brought the whole Methodist Episcopal Church into a position of antagonism to the laws of the land. I consider such action not only an outrage on the common justice of the case, but decidedly revolutionary in its movements, and destined to affect, unless repealed, the character of the Conference and all the ramifications of the Church. What is the position? The ground was taken then and here—the Church, the Bible, the Discipline, and the laws of the land to the contrary notwithstanding—that we have a right to make a man's membership depend upon the condition of his doing a thing which, as a citizen of the State, he has no power or right to do. The act which is proposed in the resolution is

part and parcel with the same affair. When Bishop Andrew has been invited to resign or desist from the exercise of his episcopal functions, or is impeached or deposed, it ought to be, and can be considered as neither more nor less than collateral in its designs and effects with the action of the Conference in the case to which I have referred.

“This is a practical question, make what disclaimers you please, or any amount of them. The common sense of the country will consider it as an infraction of the constitutional, or, if you please, the disciplinary rights of the Southern brethren, however it may be considered by those in the so-styled more favored and less encumbered portions of the Union.

“But, sir, I will present one view of this question which has not been touched upon. Set off the South, and what is the consequence? Do you get rid of embarrassment, discord, division, strife? No, sir; you multiply divisions. There will be secessions in the Northern Conferences, even if Bishop Andrew is deposed or resigns. Prominent men will abandon your Church. I venture to predict that whenever the day of division comes—and come I believe it will from the present aspect of the case—that in ten years from this day, and perhaps less, there will not be one shred of the distinctive peculiarities of Methodism left within the Conferences that depart from us. The venerable man who now presides over the Northern Conferences may live out his time as a Bishop, but he will never have a successor. Episcopacy will be given up, the presiding eldership will be given up, the itinerancy will come to an end, and Congregationalism will be the order of the day. The people will choose their own pastors, and preachers will be standing about the ecclesiastical market-places, and when men shall ask, ‘Why stand ye here all the day idle?’ the answer will be, ‘Because no man hath hired us.’ [An involuntary burst of applause was here interrupted by the chair, who said, That is wholly inadmissible.]

“We have unity and peace, and seek it because of its effects on the connection, and I believe, to-day, that if the New England Conferences were to secede, the rest of us would have peace. There would be religion enough left among us to live together as a band of Christian brothers.

“Sir, I object to the substitute for another reason. I would have preferred the original resolution. The substitute presents a most anomalous view of the whole subject. Suppose that view is adopted; what is it? What do you do with the Bishop? You cannot put him on a circuit or station: he is a Bishop in duress—a Bishop in prison bounds—an anomaly—a fifth wheel in the machine of Methodism—doomed to live on the Book Concern, while no provision is made for his rendering the Church any service, if this resolution is adopted.”

He also spoke of New England as the prime source of all the difficulty;—but for her he believed the residue of the Church would be at peace, and expressed the opinion that if the New England Conferences should secede, the Church would be gainer by it; and he wished they would do so.

Dr. Longstreet, of Georgia, next addressed the Conference in an able argument, showing, among other things, that the North have not made the concessions to the South which she has claimed to have done, pointing out the inconsistency of the proceedings in the present case, &c. He said they had laid down premises in their preamble, as the basis of their action, and then had gone on, one day and part of another, debating the subject, without attempting to give a single argument to sustain the position they had assumed, and then before the South have opportunity to discuss the question, it is exchanged for a new proposition, &c.

Mr. J. T. Peck, of Troy Conference, followed in reply to Mr. Pierce, of Georgia; and as we gave an extract from the speech of the latter, we insert the reply of the former to the principal points in Mr. Pierce's speech:—

“He [Mr. Pierce] says we have made a *false issue* in this discussion. And what is it? Why that we have discussed it as an individual matter, confined in its application to Bishop Andrew himself; whereas it was in truth a great practical question, bearing upon the whole South. We admit it, Mr. President; it is a great practical question, bearing not upon the South merely, but upon the *whole Church*. We utterly disclaim the limitation of the question to any man. We take up the issue exactly as he has laid it down. It is upon the assertion and action of a great principle of immense *practical bearing* that we predicate our arguments. It is, verily, the brother may be well assured, a matter of great *practical importance* to us, and to the Church, whether we have a slaveholding Bishop or not. Here, then, I have no contention with him.

“But, Mr. President, the brother alarmed me! He made a declaration which was to me utterly surprising! He says the great question of unity is decided! [Mr. P. explained. “Prospectively decided.”] *Prospectively* decided? to be sure! Did any one suppose it had been decided *retrospectively*? Division, then, in his mind, is really inevitable! Surely, sir, *I* had not thought so. And I am happy to say I know many brethren North and South, much more distinguished for age and experience than either of us, who do not think so. The *division* of our excellent Church decided! The unity of our common Methodism destroyed! May Heaven forbid it! I do not believe it, sir. The strong bonds that hold us together, I trust,

are not sundered! But, he says, the Baltimore appeal case virtually decided it. I do not so understand it. There were, it is true, several points of analogy between the case of Mr. Harding and that of Bishop Andrew. But the action contemplated in the case of the Bishop is widely different from that had in the case of Mr. Harding. In that case we did nothing more than to *affirm* the decision of the Baltimore Conference: and in that act say, that we would not allow slavery to be crowded on her, after she had *nobly declared she would not have it*. The appellant stood suspended from his ministerial functions. But was any such thing intended in the case of Bishop Andrew? Did the resolution affirm any such thing? Certainly not. It merely proposed that he should *desist* from the exercise of the episcopal office until he should free himself from the embarrassment of slavery. The cases then were widely different. Brethren were undoubtedly premature in asserting that the decision of the Conference in the Baltimore appeal case had prospectively determined the division of the Church! Indeed, the gentleman himself seemed to have doubts about it, when he came to consider a little; for after he had progressed in his argument so far as to consider the influence of the proposed action in the case of the Bishop, he declared, Pass that resolution, and the great question of Methodist unity is decided forever. Indeed! Then it *remains to be decided*, the Baltimore appeal case to the contrary notwithstanding! I thank the brother for that. My judgment in the case cannot be altogether groundless, since it derives support from his own declarations. Be assured, sir, I greatly rejoice in this.

“But the brother from Georgia says this measure will not save us from secessions. We shall have secessions in New England! We shall have them every where! What can be done to satisfy New England? Sir, as the name of *New England* struck my ear I felt a thrill of the most intense interest. But, the reverend gentleman proceeded, they are busy bodies in other men’s matters! A thorn in the flesh! A messenger of Satan to buffet us! And, alluding (as I understood him to do) to a certain movement in New England, and certain principles upon which that movement was based, he called it the foul spirit of the pit! the Juggernaut of perdition! &c. Upon this language, Mr. President, I may not remark! I must, of necessity, leave it without animadversion! But with the utmost respect, this dear brother will excuse me for saying I much prefer the terms used by some of his highly respected associates. I like the chaste and beautiful language of the sweet-spirited and eloquent Mr. Crowder, and the dignified and forcible style of the reverend gentleman who last preceded me. I must say, Mr. President, I deprecate the use of such language in a con-

troversy of such solemn importance—a controversy invested with more elements of moral grandeur than any which has engaged the attention of the American people for half a century! I hope the brother will not use it again, and certainly not on the floor of this General Conference.

But my friend from the Georgia Conference says, Let New England go! I wish in my heart she would secede! And joy go with her, for I am sure she will leave peace behind her! Let New England go? I cannot forget this exclamation. It vibrates in my soul in tones of grating discord. Why, sir, what is New England, that we should part with her with so little reluctance? New England! The land of the pilgrims—the land of many of our venerated fathers in Israel—the land of Broadhead—of Merritt—of the reverend man [pointing to George Pickering] who sits by my side, and a host of worthies whom we have delighted to honor as the bulwarks of Methodism in its early days of primitive purity and peril. Let New England go? No, sir, we cannot part so easily with the pioneer land of the devoted and sainted Jesse Lee!

But, Mr. President, our brethren of the South utterly mistake the truth in this matter! Why, sir, they can't get half way to New England in this war! They must wade through numbers and forces of which they never dreamed! They must encounter us in the centre, whose opposition to slavery is uncompromising. And Baltimore! (honor to her self-sacrificing devotion to the cause of humanity) will be a formidable obstacle in the way of their advance. But if they ever should subdue us, and reach the land of the pilgrims, rest assured, sir, they would find there a wall of brass which would remain forever impregnable to the assaults of the slave power! We are happy that New England is with us to a man in this fearful conflict—that the united West, and North, and East, form an insuperable barrier to the advance of slavery! O, sir, I fear me much our brethren at the South are deceiving themselves in this matter. This has never been a question of *principle* between us and New England. We have always been agreed in fundamental anti-slavery sentiments, and I am the more careful to allude to this, because, so far as I remember, it is a distinction that has not been made in this discussion. It has been purely a question of *measures* between us. In this, it is true, we have differed, but in opposition of principle to slavery, North, East and West, we always have been, and I trust shall ever remain, inseparably united. We resist, as one man, the advancement of slavery, which, not content to be confined within its own geographical limits, threatens to roll its dark waves over the North. *It claims the right to give us a slaveholding pastor! A slaveholding Bishop!* Do not then be surprised that we are so perfectly united in

asking to be set back exactly where we were a few months ago. O, sir, if our brethren could roll the wheels of time back to where they were last November, when we had, comparatively, no difficulties to encounter! But this they cannot do. What less, however, can they expect us to ask, than that they should do what is equivalent to it, give us our Bishop without the slaves?"

Saturday, May 25th. After Mr. Peck concluded the very extended speech commenced the preceding day,

Mr. A. L. P. Green, of Tennessee, addressed the Conference in opposition to the resolution. He thought the question narrowed itself to this: has the General Conference, the constitution and Discipline being judge, a right to depose a Bishop for having become connected with slavery? He thought Dr. Bangs and others, on the other side, were quite wrong in their position, that a Bishop is simply an officer of the General Conference, placed precisely on the same ground, as regards his tenure of office, with a Book Agent, an Editor of a newspaper, or a Conference Secretary. This was strange doctrine to him. An officer of the General Conference was elected for a definite period, and unless re-elected, must then necessarily go out of office. He was therefore not degraded by being removed or superceded at the end of the term for which he was elected. That or re-election must come of course. Not so a Bishop;—When once elected and consecrated, he is a Bishop for life, unless he cease to travel, or should misbehave. To put him out of office then at any time during life, unless in one of these contingencies, is to degrade him. It is like putting an Agent or an Editor out of office in the midst of the term for which he was elected. A Bishop, during life, could only get out of office by resigning or being deposed. Was this true of other officers? Or did a Book Agent have to declare solemnly that he believed he was moved by the Holy Ghost to take on him the office and work of a Book Agent? Was an Editor set apart for his work by holy rites of ordination and solemn imposition of hands?

It was said that the proposed course was mild toward Bishop Andrew. The pill might be sweetened to render it palatable, but disguise it as you will, it has in it, if taken, *episcopal death*.

As to *expediency*, so much relied on in this case, he thought while we have a Discipline designed to guide and govern our action and administration, it was *expedient* that we should respect that Discipline, no law of which was charged to have been violated by Bishop Andrew. With Paul some things were *lawful* that were not *expedient*; but with him it was never expedient to do what was *unlawful*, as is proposed in this case. The arguments used to show the power of the General Conference to act in

the absence of law, he thought not pertinent. Dr. Bangs supposed that if Bishop Andrew had married a negro woman, though there was no law of the Discipline against it, the General Conference would have power to depose him for the act; but if the law of the Discipline had provided that any minister might do that very act, under given circumstances, and then Bishop Andrew had done the act under these precise circumstances, the General Conference would have had no right or power to contravene their own law by a plea of *expediency*.

It has been said and often repeated that the sense of the Church had ever been against a slaveholding Bishop—that we had never had one, &c. He supposed that next to Bishop Asbury, Bishop McKendree was entitled to rank highest among the apostles of American Methodism, and yet Bishop McKendree had determined to buy a black boy to wait on him, and was only prevented by the dissuasion of himself and another brother.

When he heard brethren on all sides lauding the piety and talents of Bishop Andrew, and declaring he had transgressed no law, but still demanding him as a sacrifice, it seemed to be saying, “Here take him and crucify him, for I find *no fault* in him.”

Dr. Bangs rose to correct Mr. Green. *He* did not make the comparison alluded to [comparing Bishop Andrew to an Agent, &c.] A Bishop was a Bishop, and not an Agent of the General Conference. But as the General Conference created him, he thought they had power to depose or suspend him for just cause.

Mr. Green said he might be in a mistake as to the individual, but he knew he was not as to the fact that the doctrine had been advanced and advocated by that party [See Mr. Griffith’s speech.]

Monday, May 27th. Mr. Hamline, of Ohio, (now Bishop,) took the floor, in a speech of considerable length, and quite *original* in many of its views. He contended that the General Conference had the right to remove a Bishop from his office even without assigning any cause for the act, upon the same principle that a Bishop can remove a Presiding Elder, an Elder remove a circuit or stationed preacher, a preacher a class-leader, or a quarterly conference refuse to renew the license of an exhorter or local preacher, on the ground of unacceptableness. To show this power more fully, he said the General Conference is *supreme*—“Its supremacy is *universal*. It has *legislative, judicial, and executive* supremacy.” These propositions he elaborated at length. He contended that the power of the General Conference “to make *rules and regulations*” was very comprehensive. “To make rules” comprehended the

“legislative” power; “to make regulations” is executive or administrative. To appoint a preacher his work, or remove him, is a *regulation*. To appoint a Bishop to do this for the General Conference is a *regulation*. “To recall that Bishop to his former station is a *regulation*.” Whatever powers the General Conference possesses it can confer, and what it can confer it can withhold. “And what it can confer or withhold, it can *resume* at pleasure.” With regard to the power of the General Conference to act in this case without law, he says:—

“It has been urged privately, by very many, that we have no authority to displace a Bishop, except for crime and by a formal trial. And they who advocate it, tell us to look into section 4th, page 28th, and we will be convinced. Well, what now is section 4th to us, in a question of this sort? That whole section is statutory. Were it a part of our Church constitution, it might be invoked as authoritative. Mere rules as they are, and alterable by us in *ten minutes*, by two Conference votes, they expressly recognize our authority to ‘expel a Bishop for improper conduct.’ Why then urge any thing in the fourth section against this pending resolution? If there were no express rule for deposing a Bishop, we should still be competent to depose. And for this plain reason. Whatever this Conference can constitutionally do, it can do without first resolving that it has power to do it—without passing a rule into the Discipline declaring its authority. The power of this Conference is derived, not from its own enactment, but from the constitution. Is there any thing in the restrictive articles which prohibits the removal or suspension of a Bishop? This will not be pretended, and of course nothing in our own statutes can deprive us of powers conferred on us by the higher authority of the constitution.

“Suppose the fourth section provided that this body ‘has *not* power to depose a Bishop for improper conduct, if it seem necessary.’ We should still have the power to depose, because the *constitution* confers it, and that is paramount to all our resolutions and statutes. We cannot by our enactments divest ourselves of constitutional powers, no more than man made in God’s image, and about to inhabit God’s eternity, can spurn the law of his being, and divest himself of free agency and immortality.

“Now let me proceed after the manner of mathematicians. We have seen, if I mistake not, that a provision in the 4th section, page 28th, declaring our incompetency to depose, would still leave us free to do it, because the superior authority of the constitution confers the power. Much more then may we depose, if, instead of a statute forbidding it, the Discipline is silent on the subject.”

Of the meaning of the rule authorizing the General Conference to "expel a Bishop for improper conduct," he says,—

"'Have power to expel,' sets forth the extent to which we may proceed in our efforts to guard against the consequences of a Bishop's improprieties. The expulsion contemplated is doubtless from office. For though *depose* is the word generally used in such connections, *expel* is not less significant of the thing. To put out of office is expulsion."

This position is perhaps entirely new; and plausible as it may appear, has this slight inconvenience attendant on it. If to *expel* for *improper* conduct means, as Bishop Hamline tells us, to *depose* from office for an offence "less than imprudence," as the law designates no higher *crime* or *punishment* than those indicated in this clause in case of a Bishop, if he should be guilty of *murder*, the General Conference could do no more than *depose* him from office for an offence *less* than imprudence!

In carrying out his theory, Mr. Hamline uses the following language, which, without attempting to comment on, we think it proper to record:—

"That the Bishop's is an office, is, I suppose, conceded.—True, we ordain him; but we may cease to ordain, and by suspending the Conference rule which requires a day's delay, may immediately blot from the Discipline these words—page 26—"and the laying on of the hands of three Bishops, or at least one Bishop and two elders." Would not this *harmonize* our *practice* and our *principles*?"

To urge the Conference to action in this delicate and difficult case, he says, "When the Church is about to suffer detriment which we by constitutional power can avert, it is as much *treason in us not to exercise the power we have, as to usurp in other circumstances that which we have not.*"

Mr. Comfort followed on the same side, highly eulogizing the speech of Mr. Hamline, and characterizing the speeches in this discussion as "pettifogging." He said, however, that Bishop Andrew was not arraigned for "improper conduct," but simply on account of "embarrassment." He spoke of the Bishop's rumored intention to resign, to avoid this difficulty, and regarded it as most magnanimous, and the responsibility as resting on those who prevented his doing so. Division had been talked of, but he did not think the General Conference possessed any such power. He had now no fears for the unity of the Church. "He believed that so long as the President occupied that chair as senior Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, he would preside in the General Conference of the *whole* Methodist Episcopal Church."

Dr. Smith, of Virginia, next addressed the Conference. He first made a few remarks in reply to Mr. Hamline. He said,—

“From the fact that leaders and other subordinate officers of the Church, may be displaced by their superiors, he [Mr. Hamline] argues that a Bishop may be displaced at the *mere* discretion of the General Conference. To this I reply, that his analogy does not hold, because preachers and presiding elders are themselves immediately responsible to higher officers for any act by which they displace an inferior officer; but there is no body superior to the General Conference, and if it be not bound to observe its own rules in its administrative acts, then it is irresponsible. Its course is as unsteady as the fitful winds—its government is the mere will of a majority—in other words, a popular tyranny. He assigns this absolute administrative power to the General Conference—not even controlled by its own existing rules. Such was the doctrine as it fell upon my ear. To sustain this, he gives equal legislative powers. Sir, I deny the whole. I commend to his attention the report of the General Conference of 1828, in which this doctrine is repudiated in the strongest terms. This body has no such legislative or administrative powers. They are strictly bound to be governed in their acts of administration in Bishop Andrew’s case, and every other, by their own rules. As such he is entitled to a formal trial, and cannot be deposed by any other process that does not involve purely extra-judicial proceeding. I protest against any such proceeding.”

After giving briefly the history of Bishop Andrew’s connection with slavery, he proceeded:—

“Now I maintain, that in no offensive sense is Bishop Andrew a slaveholder; i. e., the sense in which the Discipline defines a slaveholder. Two attributes must attach to the act of holding this property to make it offensive in the sense of the Discipline. First. It must be received and held with an *intention* to enslave. Surely Bishop Andrew did not do this! No one has charged him with it. Second. The person holding the slave must of purpose omit to manumit, when by doing so he could secure his freedom. It is equally certain that Bishop Andrew has not done this. He is then not a slaveholder in an offensive sense. An ultra-abolitionist alone could have the hardihood to pronounce him one. It is only pretended that he is ‘connected with slavery.’ Interpret this by the offensive terms employed by speakers, and the plain meaning of the offence charged is simply this,—*that he married the lady of his choice, without stopping to consult the tastes and abolition affinities of New England Methodists! And for this he is to be dishonored before the world as having brought a stain upon Methodism.* How, sir, is this likely to be received at the South? Must there not come up, from the very foundations of society, one united voice of scathing rebuke?

“It is in vain to plead that this course is called for by reasons arising out of the character of our episcopacy as a general superintendency. The present prosecution follows directly on the heels of the Baltimore case. Mr. Harding, *an elder only*, was required by the Baltimore Conference to give an unconditional pledge that he would manumit slaves, which, under the laws of the State, did not belong to him. This General Conference has sustained their decision. Bishop Andrew, who, any more than Mr. Harding, cannot move in the matter, if he would, by reason of the laws of the State, must, we are told, share the same fate. It is purely an abolition movement. In no other light can it be received at the South.”

He proceeds to state the grounds upon which it is proposed to deprive Bishop Andrew of office,—the first of which is, that by his marriage he rendered himself unacceptable to a large portion of the Church in the North. This Dr. Smith meets in an argument of considerable length. The following are some of his remarks in stating and answering the other general positions of the party opposed to Bishop Andrew:—

“The second ground on which it is sought to convict Bishop Andrew of ‘improper conduct,’ is, that by becoming connected with slavery he has violated the ‘*settled policy of the Church.*’ But what is our policy in relation to ministers holding slaves? It is settled in the compromise rule. No one has affirmed that his case does not fall within the provisions of this rule. Then his present position is in perfect harmony with the ‘settled policy’ of the Church, as defined in the compromise rule.

“The mover of the original resolution, Rev. A. Griffith of Baltimore, did not surely have this in view. He no doubt meant, by the ‘settled policy of the Church,’ the motives which usually influenced members in voting for Bishops. Strange source, to be sure, to look to for the policy of the Church! But he is quite as unfortunate as unwise in this appeal to the policy of the Church. I present him a dilemma. The members of the General Conference of 1832, who voted for James O. Andrew as a Southern man, to be Bishop, *either did so on the principle of the COMPROMISE RULE, or they did not: if they did*, Bishop Andrew was then elected on the principle of the compromise rule, and he is not an offender against the principles of his election, because his present position in relation to slavery is within the provisions of this rule, as no one denies. *If they did not*, then they deceived the Southern portion of the Church, by publishing to the world, in the book of Discipline, that the basis of compromise laid in the rule on slavery, should govern their elections. Hence either Bishop Andrew is not an offender against the principles on which he was elected, or those who elected him were deceivers. Mr. Griffith, and his

friends who voted with him in electing Bishop Andrew in 1832, may take which horn of the dilemma they please.

"The third ground on which this *extra* proceeding is based is, that his present position, as a slaveholding Bishop, 'is in violation of the usage,' or common law of the Church. Dr. Olin, whom I regret to know has avowed himself against us in this controversy, has, nevertheless, agreed with Dr. Winans in setting aside this position, for the obvious reason that an omission to elect a slaveholder a Bishop is no proof that it is the usage of the Church that a slaveholder shall not be Bishop. But, sir, it is not with arguments of this kind I seek to engage your attention, but rather with the law in the case.

"In civil jurisprudence the common law is necessarily subordinate in authority to the statute law. So in ecclesiastical administration, the common usage must yield to the specific rule of Discipline. Consequently, if there be a usage among us which violates the plain provisions of the rule on slavery, it should be given up as contrary to Methodist Discipline. Hence if there be such a usage as that contended for so earnestly by speakers, it is of no authority at all.

"The fourth ground taken is this: '*Bishop Andrew was nominated by our Southern brethren, and elected by the General Conference of 1832, as a candidate who, though living amidst a slaveholding population, was nevertheless free from all connection with slavery;*' hence it is maintained, '*that his present position is in violation of good faith.*' * * * * *

"If Bishop Andrew was elected on the ground that he was not a slaveholder, he has assured us that it was from no pledge given or in any way authorized by him that he would not become one. *Neither does his position at present, sir, violate any obligation implied in his election.* He was elected, it is well known, because he resided in a slaveholding State, and he was expected to continue to reside there. Now, sir, can it be supposed that the General Conference of 1832 was so imbecile of mind as not to have known, at the time of his election, that from his very location and circumstances he was at all times liable to become connected with slavery, by the death of friends or by marriage—and that in all human probability he would become so connected, in process of time? In view of this obvious probability he was elected. And let me remind you that they were often told of these liabilities. I myself urged them as a reason why they should elect the individual whom I preferred, on the ground of his being a slaveholder. The answer usually given was a very natural one. We will elect Andrew in preference to one who is a slaveholder, because it will secure a more harmonious vote in the North and West; and if he should become connected with slavery, as you state, and as we

allow he may be, why then it will be in the providence of God, and fall within the provisions of the compromise rule—and *we must submit to it*. They would then turn my argument upon me, and urge me to vote for Andrew in the spirit of conciliation. And now, sir, since this result has transpired—a result which school boys could have forecast, in view of which (unless you suppose the Conference of 1832 distinguished by the merest imbecility) James O. Andrew was elected—will you now censure him? will you now seek to degrade him?”

On the point of the “general superintendency,” so much stressed in this controversy, he says:—

“It is in vain, sir, to plead in defence of this most unwarrantable proceeding, that the *constitutional feature* of our episcopacy, viz., that it shall be a *general* superintendency, demands that he should desist from the duties of his office. The plan of annually presiding in every Conference, or once within the recess of the sessions of General Conference, expired with Bishop Asbury. No one since his day has done this. Bishop Hedding has not visited the Southern Conferences, if at all, not more than once, in twenty years. Is he less a *general* superintendent for this? A general superintendency, as interpreted by the practice of late years, implies eligibility to preside in any Conference, but an actual presidency only where prudence demands it.”

Mr. J. A. Collins, of Baltimore, insisted that the usage of the Church was opposed to having a slaveholding Bishop. He replied to some remarks of Dr. Longstreet—defended the Baltimore Conference, and said “he considered his Southern brethren the most useful ministers of the Church.” He said it was due Bishop Andrew to say that he was prepared to resign when he found he was in this difficulty. Dr. Longstreet here explained on this point. When he had done,

Bishop Andrew arose and said; “the remarks of Dr. Longstreet were correct. He heard, when he arrived at Baltimore, a rumor of the intention of the Conference, and when he arrived at New York, he learned that the edict was confirmed that he must resign or be deposed. He never thought the subject would become one of grave discussion: if he had offended the Discipline, he was willing to resign, if by doing so he could remove their difficulties; he had no fondness for the episcopacy, particularly now, in the form in which it had been held up to that Conference, and he pitied the man who could remain in it, or accept it at their hands. If he could secure the peace of the Church by resigning, he would gladly do it. He had remarked that morning, in an editorial by Dr. Bond, that it was said it all rested upon him—he was to be made the scape-goat, and the destruction of the Church was to be laid upon

him. God knew it was not so—if his resignation was necessary to secure the peace of the Church, he would at once make it, and return home, labor as he had done among the slaves, and strive to save those upon whom their pretended friends were inflicting suffering and ruin.”

Mr. Collins continued. “He believed every word of it; he loved and honored the man more than any other on the bench, and he was only desirous of expressing to the Conference and the people his reasons for giving the painful vote he felt compelled to give in this case. He then submitted a preamble and resolutions as follows:—

“Whereas, the Rev. James O. Andrew, one of the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, has become connected with slavery by marriage and otherwise; and whereas a large proportion of our ministry and membership in many of the Annual Conferences are known to have been always opposed to the election of a slaveholding Bishop, believing that such an event is in contravention of the Discipline, which contemplates the episcopacy as an ‘itinerant general superintendency,’ and calculated also to strengthen the bonds of slavery; and whereas the peace and unity of the Church in the non-slaveholding Conferences will be liable to serious interruption from the connection of Bishop Andrew with slavery, without some definite action of the General Conference in relation to it; therefore,

“*Resolved*, That the members of this General Conference are constrained to express their profound regret, that Rev. James O. Andrew, one of the general superintendents, has become connected with slavery, in view of the fact, that while thus circumstanced he cannot perform the duties of his office acceptably to a large proportion of the ministers and members of our Church.

“*Resolved*, That Bishop Andrew be, and he hereby is, affectionately and earnestly requested to take the necessary measures to free himself from connection with slavery at the earliest period practicable within the ensuing four years.

“*Resolved*, That all the matter pertaining to the appeal of Rev. Silas Comfort, tried at the session of the General Conference in 1840, be erased from the journal.”

Bishop Andrew then addressed the Conference:—

“Mr. President,—I have been on trial now for a week, and feel desirous that it should come to a close. For a week I have been compelled to listen to discussions of which I have been the subject, and I must have been more than man, or less than man, not to have felt. Sir, I have felt, and felt deeply. I am not offended with any man. The most of those who have spoken against me, have treated me respectfully, and have been as

mild as I had any right to expect. I cherish no unkindly feelings toward any. I do not quarrel with my abolition brethren, though I believe their opinions to be erroneous and mischievous. Yet so long as they conduct themselves courteously toward me, I have no quarrel with them. It is due that some remarks should be made by me before the Conference come to a conclusion upon the question, which I hope will be speedily done, for I think a week is long enough for a man to be shot at, and it is time the discussion should terminate.

“As there has been frequent reference to the circumstances of my election to the episcopal office, it is perhaps proper that I give a brief history of that matter. A friend of mine (brother Hodges) now with God, asked me to permit myself to be put in nomination for that office. I objected—the office had no charms for me. I was with a Conference that I loved, and that loved me. What was I to gain to be separated from a happy home—from a wife and children whom I loved more than I did my own life? But my friend urged me; he said my election would, he believed, tend to promote the peace of the Church, and that he believed it would be especially important to the prosperity of Methodism at the South. Finally, I consented, with the hope of failure; but I was nominated and elected. I was never asked if I was a slaveholder—no man asked me what were my principles on the subject; no one dared to ask of me a pledge in this matter, or it would have been met as it deserved. Only one man, brother Winans, spoke to me on the subject: he said he could not vote for me, because he believed I was nominated under the impression that I was not a slaveholder. I told him that I had not sought the nomination, nor did I desire the office, and that my opinions on the propriety of making non-slaveholding a test of qualification for the office of Bishop, were entirely in unison with his own. Sir, I do not believe in this matter of secret will as a rule of action, either in the revelations of the Bible, or in the prescriptions of the book of Discipline. I believe in the revealed will of God, and in the written law of the Church, as contained in the book of Discipline. I took office upon the broad platform of that book, and I believe my case is covered by it. It was known that I was to reside at the South: I was elected in view of that very thing, as it was judged important to the best interests of the Church, that one of the Bishops should reside in that section of the work, and it was judged I could be more useful there than elsewhere. Well, what was I to do then? I was located in a country where free persons could not be obtained for hire; and I could not do the work of the family; my wife could not do it; what was I to do? I was compelled to hire slaves and pay their master for their hire; but I had to change them every year—they were bad

servants, for they had no interest in me or mine—and I believe it would have been less sin before God to have bought a servant who would have taken an interest in me and I in him: but I did not do so.

“At length, however, I came in possession of slaves, and I am a slaveholder, as I have already explained to the Conference, and I cannot help myself. It is known that I have waded through deep sorrows at the South during the last four years; I have buried the wife of my youth and the mother of my children, who left me with a family of motherless children, who needed a friend and a mother. I sought to make my home a happy one—and I have done so. Sir, I have no apology to make. It has been said, I did this thing voluntarily, and with my eyes open. I did so deliberately and in the fear of God—and God has blessed our union. I might have avoided this difficulty by resorting to a trick—by making over these slaves to my wife before marriage, or by doing as a friend, who has taken ground in favor of the resolution before you, suggested. ‘Why,’ said he, ‘did you not let your wife make over these negroes to her children, securing her annuity from them?’ Sir, my conscience would not allow me to do this thing. If I had done so, and those negroes had passed into the hands of those who would have treated them unkindly, I should have been unhappy. Strange as it may seem to brethren, I am a slaveholder for conscience’ sake. I have no doubt that my wife would, without a moment’s hesitation, consent to the manumission of those slaves, if I thought proper to do it. I know she would unhesitatingly consent to any arrangement I might deem it proper to make on the subject. But how am I to free them? Some of them are old, too old to work to support themselves, and are only an expense to me; and some of them are little children: where shall I send these, and who will provide for them? But perhaps I shall be permitted to keep these; but then, if the others go, how shall I provide for these helpless ones? and as to the others, to what free state should I send them? and what would be their condition? Besides, many of them would not go—they love their mistress, and could not be induced under any circumstances to leave her. Sir, an aged and respectable minister said to me several years ago, when I had stated just such a case to him, and asked him what he would do, ‘I would set them free,’ said he, ‘I’d wash my hands of them, and if they went to the devil, I’d be clear of them.’ Sir, into such views of religion or philanthropy my soul cannot enter. I believe the providence of God has thrown these creatures into my hands, and he holds me responsible for their proper treatment. I have secured them to my wife by a deed of trust since our marriage. This arrangement was only in

accordance with an understanding existing previous to marriage. These servants were hers; she had inherited them from her former husband's estate; they had been her only source of support during her widowhood, and would still be her only dependence if it should please God to remove me from her. I have nothing to leave her. I have given my life to the Church from the days of my youth, [and I am now fifty,] and although, as I have previously remarked, she would consent to any arrangement I might make, yet I cannot consent to take advantage of her affection for me to induce her to do what would injure her without at all benefitting the slaves.

"Sir, I did not for a moment believe that this body of grave and reverend ministers would make this a subject of serious discussion. I thought it likely that there might be some warm ultra brethren who would take some exceptions to my course, and on that account I did not make the deed of trust before marriage, lest some should suppose I designed to dodge the responsibility of the case. Those who know me must know that I would not be governed by the mere matter of dollars and cents. What can I do? I have no confession to make; I intend to make none. I stand upon the broad ground of the Discipline, on which I took office; and if I have done wrong put me out. The Editor of the Christian Advocate has prejudged this case. He makes me the scape-goat of all the difficulties which abolition excitement has gotten up at the North. I am the only one to blame, in his opinion, should mischief grow out of this case. But I repeat, if I have sinned against the Discipline, I refuse not to die. I have spent my life for the benefit of the slaves. When I was but a boy I taught a Sunday school for slaves, in which I taught a number of them to read, and from that period till this day I have devoted my energies to the promotion of their happiness and salvation—with all my influence, in private, in public, with my tongue, with my pen, I have assiduously endeavored to promote their present and eternal happiness. And am I to be sacrificed by those who have done little or nothing for them? It is said, I have rendered myself unacceptable to our people. I doubt this. I have just returned from Philadelphia, where they knew me to be a slaveholder; yet they flocked to hear me, and the presence of God was with us; we had a good, warm, old-fashioned meeting. I may be unacceptable in New York, yet from the experience I have had I doubt even that. To whom am I unacceptable? Not to the people of the South, neither masters nor slaves. Has my connection with slaves rendered me less acceptable to the colored people of the South; the very people for whom all this professed sympathy is felt? Does the fact that I am a slaveholder make me less respectable among

them? Let those who have labored long among them answer the question. Sir, I venture to say, that in Carolina or Georgia, I could to-day get more votes for the office of Bishop from the colored people, than any supporter of this resolution, let him avow himself an emancipator as openly as he pleases. To the colored people of the South then, and to their owners; to the entire membership of the slaveholding Conferences, I would not be unacceptable; but perhaps they are no part of 'our people.' In short, sir, I believe I should not be unacceptable to one half the connection; but on this question I have nothing to say. Should the Conference think proper to pass me, there is plenty of ground where I can labor acceptably and usefully. The slaveholding Conferences will present a field sufficiently large for me, should I live to the age of Methuselah; and the Bishops, in arranging the work, will certainly have discretion enough not to send me where I would not be received; nor would I obtrude myself upon any Conference, or lay my hands on the head of any brother who would feel himself contaminated by the touch. However, on this subject I have nothing to say. The Conference can take its course, but I protest against the proposed action as a violation of the laws of the Discipline, and an invasion of the rights secured to me by that book. Yet, let the Conference take the steps they contemplate; I enter no plea for mercy; I make no appeal for sympathy. Indeed, I love those who sympathize with me, but I do not want it now. I wish you to act coolly and deliberately, and in the fear of God; but I would rather that the Conference would change the issue, and make the resolution to depose the Bishop, and take the question at once, for I am tired of it. The country is becoming agitated on the subject, and I hope the Conference will act forthwith on the resolution."

Mr. Sehon said he had become a practical emancipator; but it was doubtful if he had benefitted his slaves by the act, as they had become paupers, dependant on charity.

He did not question the power of the General Conference to depose a Bishop for good cause, after regular trial, but not in the informal and summary way in which they were proceeding against Bishop Andrew. He was confident that in many places in the non-slaveholding States, Bishop Andrew would now be received with as much cordiality as at any time heretofore.

Mr. Winans, of Mississippi, said, that he should confine his remarks to the fundamental principles. He denied that the General Conference had any administrative power whatever, and certainly not the plenary power attributed to it by the brother from Ohio, Mr. Hamline. It is only a creature, having delegated attributes, and no other. After many other remarks,

he said he had spoken too long, but if he had the strength, he would protract the debate till January, rather than they should be driven forth a ruined community—dissevered, destroyed, and gloried over by other denominations, who were more prudent in these matters than themselves.

Mr. Finley said he had been taught that there was no conservation for slavery in Methodism; there never had been, and he hoped there never would be. If so, he would seek another body. He contended that when a Bishop or minister refused to free slaves when he could do it, he could be cut off from the Methodist Episcopal Church. He had been astonished, he said, at many of the reasons given by the speakers on the question, and particularly with regard to the subject of slavery. He had always taken ground against it—he had preached against it in the face of slaveholders, and told them to their teeth that it was an evil, and that they were doing wrong. He believed that slavery would never have taken the stand it had, but for the connection of Methodist ministers with it. He had heard that it was done out of charity to the slaves, but he did not understand it so; he thought it a queer kind of charity to sell a man.

Mr. Finley said, "This resolution is modified to the most easy requirement it could be to meet the feelings of Southern brethren, and to cover the principle, and from this ground *I will not be moved*. No, sir; on this ground will I stand until I die." He said, to retain a slaveholder in the episcopacy would be equivalent to voting for a slaveholder directly for that office, and that "It would violate the constituted law. It would injure, if not totally destroy, this vital organ of our itinerancy." "Any man who can say it is right for him to hold his fellow being in bondage, and buy and sell him at pleasure, put him under an overseer, and *drive, whip, and half starve him*, and that this is connived at by the Methodist Church, I think must have a queer view of the Church and her Discipline. I now say before God, that whenever the Methodist Episcopal Church shall sanction this doctrine, as much as I love her, I will leave her and seek another." "I never will agree that slavery shall be connected in any way with episcopacy; nor any where else, only by necessity. I must state again, that from this principle *I never will be removed*."

Mr. Cartwright addressed the Conference in support of the pending resolution, in a speech of some length, partly in a playful strain, but of a miscellaneous and desultory character, rendering a *sketch* of it nearly impracticable.

Mr. Stamper spoke in opposition to the resolution, and especially defended the doctrine that the law governing the subject of slavery, was one of *compromise*, to which the General

Conference was sacredly bound to adhere; but the substitute could not be passed without a violation of that law, and he was therefore bound to oppose the measure.

May 29th. The Conference passed a resolution giving leave to Bishop Soule and his colleagues to address the body in the case of Bishop Andrew, if they saw fit, when Mr. Dunwody, who was entitled to the floor, had concluded his remarks.

After the passage of the resolution, the case of Bishop Andrew was continued.

Mr. Dunwody, of South Carolina, took the floor. After some preliminary remarks, he said he was opposed to the resolution on three grounds: First, it was unscriptural; secondly, it was contrary to the Discipline; and, thirdly, it would be mischievous in its effects. He spoke at considerable length.

Bishop Soule then delivered to the Conference the following address:—

“I do not know but this may be a favorable moment for me to offer to the Conference the few remarks I desire to make before final action shall be had on the subject which is now pending before the Conference. I have had no solicitude with regard to the period of time when I should offer these remarks, only that it might be a time of calmness and reflection. I will indulge the hope that this is such a time, and therefore avail myself of the opportunity. I rise, sir, at this moment, as I before said, with all the calmness which the occasion, I think, requires. But this is not the calm that precedes the tempest and the storm; it is not the calmness of indifference; it cannot be. It is, sir, the calmness of conviction. It is the calmness of principle. If indeed I could be persuaded that my very respectable brother from the Pittsburgh Conference was entirely correct in his opinion, that all the light which could be furnished on this subject had been furnished, I should not rise here. There is a possibility that the brother may be mistaken. I cannot say that I should have foreborne to arise though I had been convinced of the correctness of the judgment of the respected brother from New England, that though we should sit here till January next, no brother would be changed in his vote on this question. I say—I do not know that I should have foreborne my observations though I might have been convinced of the correctness of this opinion; but if no more *light* could be produced, any thing that I could say would be unavailing.

There are periods, sir, in the history of the life of every man who sustains any important station in society, who holds any important relations to it, when his individual character cannot, must not be neutralized by the laws of association. Under this view, in what I shall say to this Conference, I involve no man in responsibility. My venerable colleagues are in no way

concerned in what I shall say to this Conference, so that however I may be involved, they are not involved. The South, on my right is not involved. The North on my left, is not involved. I stand in this regard alone. I hope not, indeed, alone in the sentiments that I shall express to the Conference. Brethren have manifested a solicitude to bring the question to an issue—to close the debate and come to the vote. I ask brethren if it is not possible, notwithstanding the time which has been employed in this discussion, notwithstanding the large views which brethren have expressed on the question before them,—I ask is it not possible that action on the resolution may not yet be premature? Society, sir, whether civil or religious, has much more to fear from the passions of men—of its members—than it has to fear from calm investigation and sober inquiry. I am not afraid to meet the calmness of deliberation any where. I am not afraid to meet it here; I am not afraid to meet it in the Annual Conference; I am not afraid to meet it before the great religious community of which we are members and ministers. I am not; but I fear the rage of the passions of men. I fear excitements, ardent excitements, prematurely produced in society; and I apprehend that if we trace the history of associations, whether civil or ecclesiastical, we shall find that these premature excitements, waking up the rage of passion, have produced greater calamities than ever were produced by the calmness of deliberation and the sobriety of inquiry, however extensive those investigations may have been. The sound of the trumpet of alarm may go forth from within these consecrated walls—the sound may spread itself on the wings of the wind, or of the whirlwind, over the length and breadth of these lands; but, sir, when this sound shall have died away, when the elements which may have been awakened to boisterous and tumultuous action, shall subside into the calmness of inquiry and reason, a voice may return to this hall, wafted on a counterbreeze; and though the voice be not heard in the thunder, the earthquake, or the storm, it may pierce through the veil of our speculations, and our theories, and the first sound will be heard in the inquiry, ‘*What is the cause?*’ Well, sir, it will be the province of reason and sobriety to answer. Here it is, sir, spread out before me, spread out before you, in a plain, unsophisticated statement of facts by Bishop Andrew. I have not heard a brother from the North—I have not heard a brother from the South—(and I have listened to hear)—allege that there were any other facts, that there were any other circumstances having any bearing whatever on the merits of the case now before you. I take it for granted, then, that we have the entire facts of the case before us; and these facts are the cause of whatever alarm, whatever excitement

may have spread through our beloved Zion, and over this continent.

“Now, sir, I beg the indulgence of the Conference while I read an extract from the address of your general superintendents at your last session. You will indulge me in this.

“The experience of more than half a century, since the organization of our ecclesiastical body, will afford us many important lights and landmarks, pointing out what is the safest and most prudent policy to be pursued in our onward course as regards African slavery in these States, and especially in our own religious community: This very interesting period of our history is distinguished by several characteristic features, having a special claim to our consideration at the present time, particularly in view of the unusual excitement which now prevails on the subject, not only in the different Christian Churches, but also in the civil body. And first, our general rule on slavery, which forms a part of the constitution of the Church, has stood from the beginning unchanged, as testamentary of our sentiments on the principle of slavery, and the slave trade. And in this we differ in no respect from the sentiments of our venerable founder, or from those of the wisest and most distinguished statesmen and civilians of our own and other enlightened and Christian countries. Secondly, in all the enactments of the Church relating to slavery, a due and respectful regard has been had to the laws of the States, never requiring emancipation in contravention of civil authority, or where the laws of the States would not allow the liberated slave to enjoy freedom. Thirdly, the simply holding or owning slaves, without regard to circumstances, has not, at any period of the existence of the Church, subjected the master to excommunication. Fourthly, rules have been made from time to time, regulating the sale and purchase and holding of slaves, with reference to the different laws of the States where slavery is tolerated; which, upon the experience of the great difficulties of administering them, and the unhappy consequences both to masters and servants, have been as often changed or repealed.

“These important facts, which form prominent parts of our past history as a Church, may very properly lead us to inquire for that course of action in future which may be best calculated to preserve the peace and unity of the whole body, promote the greatest happiness of the slave population, and advance generally, in the slaveholding community of our country, the humane and hallowing influence of our holy religion. We cannot withhold from you, at this eventful period, the solemn conviction of our minds, that no new ecclesiastical legislation on the subject of slavery, at this time, will have a tendency to accomplish these most desirable objects. And we are fully

persuaded, that as a body of Christian ministers we shall accomplish the greatest good by directing our individual and united efforts, in the spirit of the first teachers of Christianity, to bring both master and servant under the sanctifying influence of the principles of that gospel which teaches the duties of every relation, and enforces the faithful discharge of them by the strongest conceivable motives. Do we aim at the amelioration of the condition of the slave? How can we so effectually accomplish this, in our calling as ministers of the gospel of Christ, as by employing our whole influence to bring both him and his master to a saving knowledge of the grace of God, and to a practical observance of those relative duties so clearly prescribed in the writings of the inspired apostles?

“‘Permit us to add, that although we enter not into the political contentions of the day, neither interfere with civil legislation, nor with the administration of the laws, we cannot but feel a deep interest in whatever affects the peace, prosperity, and happiness of our beloved country. The union of these States, the perpetuity of the bonds of our national confederation, the reciprocal confidence of the different members of the great civil compact,—in a word, the *well-being* of the community of which we are members, should never cease to lie near our hearts, and for which we should offer up our sincere and most ardent prayers to the Almighty Ruler of the universe.

“‘But can we, as ministers of the gospel, and servants of a Master ‘whose kingdom is not of this world,’ promote these important objects in any way so truly and permanently as by pursuing the course just pointed out? Can we, at this eventful crisis, render a better service to our country than by laying aside all interference with relations authorized and established by the civil laws, and applying ourselves wholly and faithfully to what especially appertains to our ‘high and holy calling;’ to teach and enforce the moral obligations of the gospel, in application to all the duties growing out of the different relations in society? By a diligent devotion to this evangelical employment, with an humble and steadfast reliance upon the aid of divine influence, the number of ‘believing masters’ and servants may be constantly increased, the kindest sentiments and affections cultivated, domestic burdens lightened, mutual confidence cherished, and the peace and happiness of society be promoted. While, on the other hand, if past history affords us any correct rules of judgment, there is much cause to fear that the influence of our sacred office, if employed in interference with the relation itself, and consequently with the civil institutions of the country, will rather tend to prevent, than to accomplish, these desirable ends.’

“Sir, I have read this extract, that the members of this Gen-

eral Conference who were not present at the last session, and this listening assembly, who may not have heard it before, may understand distinctly the ground on which I, with my colleagues, stand in regard to these questions. I desire that this document may stand recorded with my name to it, till I sleep in the dust of the earth. (Amen.) I desire to leave it as a legacy to my children and my children's children, and if I might be permitted to say so, I would leave it as a legacy to the Church when I am no more. I want no man to write my epitaph. I will write it myself. I want no man to write and publish my life: I'll do that myself as far as I think it may be necessary for the interests of posterity or for the benefit of the Church of God. I regret, in reading the life of my venerable colleague, who has gone from earth to heaven since your last session, that this document, as it stood connected with his name, has not appeared in that memoir. I thank the author of 'The History of the Methodist Episcopal Church,' I mean Dr. Bangs, for having presented this document in that History. I met it in Europe, and I am glad it is there. I never wished my name detached from it, no never, *never*. When this was written, your superintendents believed that they were acting in perfect accordance with the pastoral address of the General Conference at its session in Cincinnati—we think so now. Well, sir, I have only one further remark to make before I proceed to the chief object for which I address the Conference this morning. It is this. I desire that no undue influence may be produced from the peculiar relation in which I stand to the Church. Sympathy may exert too great an influence when it is brought to bear on great principles. The only subject which has awakened my sympathy during the whole discussion, is the condition of my suffering brethren of the colored race, and this never fails to do it. No matter where I meet the man of color, whether in the South, or in the North with the amount of liberty he enjoys, the sympathies of my nature are awakened for him. Could I restore bleeding Africa to freedom, to independence, to the rights—to *all* the rights of man, I would gladly do it. But this I cannot do—you cannot do. And if I cannot burst the bonds of the colored man, I will not strengthen them. If I cannot extend to him all the good I would, I will never shut him out from the benefits which I have it in my power to bestow. But, sir, I cannot withhold this sentiment from the Conference, that with the mental and physical labors of this relation, I could never have been sustained—I could never have supported myself—I could never have ministered to the Church unless I had been settled down on some principles equally as changeless as the throne of God, in my estimation, never, never. It is a constant recurrence to these great principles that has

sustained me in the discharge of what I conceive to be my duties—duties which grow out of my relation to the Church, and not simply to this Conference. These principles have sustained me in the city and in the desert waste; they have sustained me in the North, and they have sustained me in the South; they have sustained me in the quarters of the black man, and in the huts of the red man. Shake me from these principles, and I am done!—I have done, I say. But what is this? Why, sir, is the Methodist Episcopal Church dependant upon me? Far from it; her interest hangs not upon my shoulders at all. She can do a great deal better without me than I can do without her; much better. Well, sir, laying aside this point—endeavoring to disengage myself as far as possible, consider me as expressing my own opinions, without reference to my colleagues. I wish to say, explicitly, that if the superintendents are only to be regarded as the officers of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and consequently as officers of the Methodist Episcopal Church, liable to be deposed at will by a simple majority of this body, without a form of trial, no obligation existing growing out of the constitution and laws of the Church, even to assign cause wherefore—I say, if this doctrine be a correct one, every thing I have to say hereafter is powerless, and falls to the ground. But brethren will permit me to say, strange as it may seem, although I have had the honor and privilege to be a member of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church ever since its present organization, though I was honored with a seat in the convention of ministers which organized it, in this respect I have heard for the first time, either on the floor of this Conference, in an Annual Conference, or through the whole of the private membership of the Church, this doctrine advanced: this is the first time I ever heard it. Of course it struck me as a novelty. I am not going to enter the arena of controversy with this Conference. I desire that my position may be defined. I desire to understand my landmarks as a Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church—not the Bishop of the General Conference, not the Bishop of any Annual Conference. I thought that the constitution of the Church—I thought that its laws and regulations—I thought that the many solemn vows of ordination, the parchment which I hold under the signatures of the departed dead; I thought that these had defined my landmarks—I thought that these had prescribed my duties—I thought that these had marked out my course. In my operations, I have acted under the conviction that these were my directions and landmarks, and it affords me great consolation this day to stand, at least in the judgment of this body, to which I hold myself responsible, and before which I

will always be ready to appear to answer any charge they shall prefer against me—I say it affords me some gratification to have stood acquitted for twenty years in the discharge of the high trust committed to my hands; and I here desire to offer my grateful acknowledgments to the Episcopal Committee for the report they have brought to this body, and to the Conference, for their cordial acceptance of that report. I say I do it with sentiments of sincerity; and it is the more cordial to me in view of what may yet be to come. In this regard, although I have trembled beneath the weight of responsibility, and shrunk before the consciousness of my inability, and especially as I have felt my physical infirmities coming upon me; and knowing that I must be in the neighborhood of mental infirmity, I stand this day acquitted in my own conscience—(O that I may be acquitted at the bar of my eternal Judge)—that I have to the best of my ability, with sincerity of heart, and with the ardent desire to promote the great interests of the Church, and the cause of God, in the discharge of the duties which you have intrusted to me—I have never, in the discharge of this trust—God is my witness—I have never given an appointment to any preacher with a desire or design to afflict him. Indeed, if I could do it, I should abhor myself. Now, sir, whether this Conference is to sustain the position on which I have acted, or not, they are very soon to settle in the vote which is before them: I mean, they are to settle this question, whether it is the right of this body, and whether they have the power, to depose a Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church—whether they have a right to depose my colleague—to depose me, without a form of trial. See ye to that. Without specification of wrong, and by almost universal acclamation over this whole house, that Bishop Andrew has been unblamable in his Christian character; without blame in his ministerial vocation; that he has discharged the duties of his sacred office to the Church of God with integrity, with usefulness, and with almost universal acceptability, and in good faith;—with this declaration before the community, before the world, will this Conference occupy this position, that they have power, authority to depose Bishop Andrew, without a form of trial, without charge, and without being once called on to answer for himself in the premises? what he did say was voluntary.

Well, brethren, I had conceived—I had understood from the beginning, that special provision was made for the trial of a Bishop. The constitution has provided that no preacher, no person was to be deprived of the right of trial, according to the forms of Discipline, and of the right of appeal; but, sir, if I understand the doctrine advanced and vindicated, it is that you may depose a Bishop without form of trial; you may

depose him without any obligation to show cause, and therefore he is the only minister in your Church who has no appeal. It seems to me that the Church has made special provision for the trial of the Bishop, for the special reason that the Bishop has no appeal. Well now, sir, I only make these observations, as I said, to the ear of reason. You will remember that this whole thing is going out before the world, as well as the Church. I wish to know my landmarks, to find out where I stand; for indeed I don't hesitate to say to you, that if my standing and the relation in which I have been placed by the Methodist Episcopal Church under my solemn vows of ordination—if my relation is to stand on the voice of a simple majority of this body, without a form of trial, and without an obligation even to show me cause why I am deposed, I have some doubt whether there is the man on this floor that would be willing to stand in my place. Now brethren will perceive at once the peculiar situation in which I am placed. Here are my brethren from the Ohio and from other Conferences. We have been together in great harmony and peace. There has been great union of spirit every where; but I said at the beginning, there were periods in the history of every man occupying any important relation or station in society, when his individual character and influence could not be neutralized by the laws of association. You must unmoor me from my anchorage on the basis of this book, you must unsettle me from the principles—my settled and fixed principles. From these I cannot be shaken by any influences on my right hand or on my left hand—neither the zeal of youth nor the experience of hoary age shall move me from my principles. Convince me that I am wrong, and I yield. And here it may be necessary that I should make an observation in regard to what I have said before—it seems to have been misunderstood—I said, you cannot immolate me on a Southern altar; you cannot immolate me on a Northern altar; I can only be immolated on the altar of the union of the Methodist Episcopal Church. What do I mean by this? I mean—call it a compact—call it a compromise, constitutional discipline, what you will—I mean on the doctrines and provisions of this book, and I consider this as the bond of union of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Here then I plant my feet, and here I stand. Let brethren, sir, not misunderstand me in another point, a point in which they may misunderstand me, in which I have been misunderstood, and you join me on this point. I hold that the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church has an indisputable right, constitutional, sacred, to arraign at her tribunal every Bishop; to try us there; to find us guilty of an offence with which we are charged on evidence, and to excommunicate—expel us. I

am always ready to appear before that body in this regard. I recognize fully their right. But not for myself—not for these men on my right hand and on my left hand, but for your sakes and the Church of God of which you are members and ministers, let me ask you, let me entreat you not to rush upon the resolution now before you. Posterity, sir, will review your actions, history will record them; and whatever we may do here will be spread out before the face of the world; the eyes of men will be fixed upon it. In this view I was not surprised to hear brethren say, ‘Pause, brethren, I beseech you pause;’ and I was not surprised to see men of mind and of thought approach the thing with fear and trembling; but brethren apprehend that there are great difficulties involved in this subject; they apprehend that fearful consequences are to take place on which ever side of the question they shall move. Pass it, and the South suppose themselves involved in irretrievable ruin. Refuse to pass it, and the North consider the consequences perilous to them. Permit me to say, sir, that I have had some acquaintance, personal acquaintance, both with the North and the South; I think I have been able to cast an impartial eye over these great departments of the Church. I may err in judgment, but I apprehend that the difficulties may not be as insurmountable as brethren have apprehended them to be. I know that some of my brethren of the North are involved in such a manner that I cannot apprehend—I see no way in which they can compromise this question. Why? For the obvious reason that it involves a principle. I will compromise with no man when a principle is involved in the compromise. What is that principle? The men that avow it are as honest as any men on this floor. I know them: in the men there is no guile. What is the principle? It was advanced by my worthy brother Cass the other day. Can he compromise the principle? You must convince him of the error of his principle before he will compromise it. What is it? It is that slavery, under all circumstances, is sin against God.”

Mr. Cass interposed—“May I correct the Bishop? I believe I did not say so—I said it was a moral evil.”

Bishop Soule proceeded—“Well, I am glad to be corrected. This is not brother Cass’s principle. A moral evil—a moral evil, and not a sin, under all circumstances. It affords me a great deal of pleasure to hear my worthy brother’s statement, for it greatly increases my hope that we shall have a compromise.”

“Now, sir, notwithstanding brethren have thought, and with perfect sincerity, that they were ready to act on the resolution—although undoubtedly a large majority of this body have been prepared for it for some time, I cannot but believe that it

might be premature in the Conference taking action on it even now. I will offer one or two reasons why I think the Conference is not prepared for action on the resolution. We have been informed here from documents—to a great extent petitions and memorials—on the subject of slavery in its various aspects and interests. These documents—these petitions and memorials—have been received with the respect due to the right of petition. They have been committed to a large and judicious committee to examine and report. That committee has not reported to this body; it will report—I need not say to you that it will report. The respect due to some thousand petitioners to this body will lay them under solemn obligations to report; and is it not possible that this report on the subject immediately connected with the resolution before you—may not afford you some light? You will have in the report of that committee several important items, clearly developed before you of information. You will know the number of petitioners—of the memorialists in each of the Annual Conferences. You will know the relative proportion of these petitioners to the whole number of the Methodist Church within these Conferences. You will know the aggregate number of all these memorialists and petitioners, and you will consequently know the relative number in regard to the whole community of the Methodist Episcopal Church. It will not be disputed, I think, on the floor of this General Conference, that the subjects, so far as they have been presented when the memorials were up, that the subjects on which you are memorialized in these documents are not local. They are not subjects appertaining specially and exclusively to the memorialists. So far as I heard, every subject was of a general character, in which every member of the Methodist Episcopal Church, East, West, North, and South, have an equal interest and concern. The report of your committee may throw much light on this great subject. But this is not all. I beg to suggest to the brethren that the views of the great body of the Methodist Church, and the great body of her ministers, are not, and cannot be represented here, in regard to the special point before you; and if this be a subject in which all the ministers of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and all the members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, have an equal interest and concern, is it safe for this body to proceed to such an important action with regard to the whole interests of the Church, without having a more full development of the subject, both from ministers and Church, than the memorials as yet presented afford? I ask it. Now will the delegation from New York tell us what are the views of the great body of Methodists within the New York Conference on this subject? We have been sitting here, Mr. President, on this case almost from the

time we commenced it. It has been, however, before this community. It has been out before the whole Church, and from the views the brethren have taken, I have been almost surprised that we have not had memorials from the city where we sit; I have been almost surprised that we have not had memorials from the people in Philadelphia, from the people in Baltimore, from the people in Boston. We have had no memorials. There has been no expression on their part, as I have heard; and yet in the midst of this enlightened body of Methodists are we prepared thus to say what is the view of the people around us on this question? and under such circumstances, do you hesitate to stay the question in the resolution before you? I beg the brethren to go a little further on this subject. I will go with my brethren to Ohio. Now I do not know—I am a resident in Ohio—I have some acquaintance in Ohio, both with preachers and with our very excellent and worthy membership in Ohio—my brethren from them, these delegates, have more, and doubtless can say more; but I should not dare on the floor of this Conference to say that the act would meet the approbation of the great body of preachers and members in Ohio: I dare not say it. It is sufficient for me, however, in the present position I occupy to say, that the Church has not known the subject, and has expressed no opinion on the subject whatsoever. I settle it down, then, as the basis on which I shall proceed, that we have not, and cannot have the views of our ministers and people generally on this subject, so fully expressed to us as to others.

“The adoption of that resolution deposes Bishop Andrew without form or trial—such is my deliberate opinion: I do not believe it is safe for you, and I am out of the question. What shall be done? The question, I know, wakes up the mind of every brother. Can it be possible that the Methodist Episcopal Church is in such a state of excitement—in such a state, I had almost said, of revolution, as to be unprepared to send out the plain, simple facts in the case to the Churches, to the Annual Conferences, every where through our community, and waive all action on this subject till another General Conference?

“I said, almost at the commencement of these remarks, sir, that I was not afraid of the deliberation of men, of our Annual Conferences, of the General Conference—I am afraid of the passions of men, and I could present before you some considerations to illustrate the views that I have given you; and if I give you these views in error of judgment, be assured that they are not views which originate on the spur of the moment: they are the result of sober and deliberate investigation. Can it be possible that the simple circumstance of Bishop Andrew’s

holding an office as a Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church four years longer, with this statement of facts in the case—simple facts in the case—spread out before the enlightened body of this great Methodist community—is there to be an earthquake? I am not prepared to believe it: I soberly am not prepared to believe it. Well, sir, this is the view that I take of the subject. Permit me to make one other suggestion. The providence of God directs the whirlwind and the storm; clouds and darkness indeed may be around about us, but righteousness and justice are the habitation of his throne. Let us be careful that we never suffer a human arm to impede the operations of providence. My beloved colleague, Bishop Andrew, and myself, and all my colleagues, may have passed away from these scenes of trouble—and the passions which now agitate the Church of God, may go to sleep, in God's providence, long before four years go by.

“How easy it is for God to direct the elements of society! Don't be surprised, then, brethren, when I say to you, pause. Brethren may possibly have a little more light: there may be some ray from heaven or earth yet to shine upon this subject. Now it is the solemn conviction of my mind that the safest course you can pursue in the premises is to pass this subject without any implication of Bishop Andrew's character at all, and to send out officially the plain and simple facts in the case to all your societies—to all your Conferences. Let it be read every where, and then we may have a further expression of opinion, without any kind of agitation. I am about to take my leave of you, my brethren. You must know—you cannot but know, that with the principles I have stated to you—with the avowal of my sentiments in regard to this subject—it would not be Bishop Andrew alone that your word will affect! No sir,—I implicate neither my colleagues on my right hand nor on my left; but I say the decision of the question could not affect Bishop Andrew alone. I wish it to be distinctly understood, it *cannot affect him alone*. I mean specially in this point—I say that the resolution on which we are just about to act goes to sustain the doctrine that the General Conference have power and right to depose one of the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church without the form of trial—that you are under no obligation from the constitution or laws of the Church to *show cause* even. Now every man must see, and every man must know, that Bishop Andrew cannot be involved alone in the vote. It is the principle which is involved. It goes to say that when this Conference shall vote on the subject—a simple majority of the Conference, without form or trial, can depose a Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Do you understand it so? If I am mistaken, I shall stand corrected—and I

need not say to this Conference that such a decision will involve others beside. It involves the office; it involves the charge; it involves the relation itself.

“And now, in taking leave, I offer devout prayer to Almighty God that you may be directed wisely in the decision you are about to make. I have given to you what in my sober and deliberate judgment is the best and safest course which you can pursue—safest for all concerned. I want that opinion to have no more influence upon you than it justly deserves in the Conference. I thank the Conference for the attention they have been pleased to give me. I thank the audience for their attention. I very well know—I am not at all unapprised that the position I occupy—in which I stand on the principles of that resolution—on the principles involved in it—may seal my fate. I say I am not at all unapprised of that. Let me go; but I pray you hold to principles—to principles; and with these remarks I submit the whole to your and God’s direction.—(Amen.)”

Dr. Durbin next addressed the Conference at considerable length. He contended that it was only necessary to know in a given case, that *emancipation was practicable*, leaving out of view the enjoyment of *freedom* by the *liberated slave*. The course of concession, Dr. Durbin said, had always been from the North to the South, but admitted those concessions had been made to the necessities of the South, and were properly made. He contended that the sole power of the Bishop was derived from his *election* by the General Conference, and that therefore that body had rightful power to dispose of him as they might deem for the good of the Church. Of the character of the action proposed in Bishop Andrew’s case, Dr. Durbin spoke as follows:—

“Now, sir, this action is *not* contemplated without cause. The preamble states the ground of action clearly and distinctly, in a statement of undisputed and indisputable facts. And what does the resolution propose? Expulsion? No, sir. Deposition? No. If I am pressed to a decision of this case in its present form, I shall vote for that substitute, and so will many others; but if, after we *have* voted for it, any man should come and tell us personally that we have voted to *depose* Bishop Andrew, we should consider it a personal—shall I say—insult, sir? The substitute proposes only to express the sense of this Conference in regard to a matter which it cannot in duty and conscience pass by without a suitable expression; and having made the solemn expression, it leaves Bishop Andrew to act as *his* sense of duty shall dictate. Will any of the brethren on the other side of the house tell us that if such is our deliberate sense, and we deem it our duty to the Church to say so, we ought to suppress it?”

He stressed the point, that as by the constitution a Bishop was to be a "*general superintendent*," any thing that would render him unacceptable to any portion of the work, must disqualify him for the proper exercise of his episcopal functions; and as a connection with slavery would have that effect in many of the Northern Conferences, Bishop Andrew could not, while that incumbrance remained, be a *general superintendent* in the proper and constitutional sense.*

Dr. Durbin closed his speech with the following remarks and resolution:—

"I will conclude, sir, by saying, a few days ago brother Early, from Virginia, threw out a suggestion, at the close of the session, viz., *might not this matter be referred back to the Church or the Conferences?* This course was distinctly advised by yourself, sir, this morning, in your address to the Conference. These weighty facts led me to believe that the North would meet the South on the following resolution, which I would willingly offer if I had the least intimation that our brethren from the South would meet us on it, viz:

"*Resolved*, That the case of Bishop Andrew be referred to the Church, and that the judgment of the next General Conference be deemed and taken to be the voice of the Church, whether Bishop Andrew shall continue to exercise his functions as a general superintendent in the Methodist Episcopal Church while he sustains the relation to slavery as stated in his com-

* There is certainly something remarkable in the manner in which this argument of *general superintendency*—the sole basis of the action against Bishop Andrew—was used on that occasion. A general superintendency does not imply a *universal* superintendency, extending to every part. A learned writer says, "The *general* is to the *universal* what a *part* is to the *whole*. The *general* rule admits many exceptions, the *universal* rule admits of none." (Eng. Synonyms.) *General* in this case is placed in opposition to *local—diocesan*. At the time the rule was adopted, there were seven Conferences, and it was proposed to have a Bishop for each Conference. This rule was intended to put down and keep down this project of local, Conference Bishops, and to provide that a Bishop should be limited to no particular Conference or work. But further, Southern brethren met this popular and successful argument, by saying to the majority, "If you depose Bishop Andrew—directly or indirectly—you will not fill his place, thus vacated, with a Southern man; for if he only voted to sustain the Bishop, he would be as unacceptable at the North as the Bishop himself; and if you fill his place with one who takes part against him, he cannot be a general superintendent in your sense, because he will be as unacceptable to the South as Bishop Andrew can be to the North." The majority, however, seemed to see no force at all in the argument, but passed the resolution, and then filled the episcopal chair with the man who had been more ultra in his opposition to Bishop Andrew, and sustained his opposition by more daring departures from the settled principles of Methodism, than any other man in the Conference. Of course, in their sense of the term, he could not be a general superintendent, for he could not preside in the Southern Conferences at all; and when elected, it must have been well known to all, that his course against Bishop Andrew would render him so utterly unacceptable in the South as to render him entirely unavailable. Here, by their own action, the sole objection upon which they relied in displacing Bishop Andrew is made to bear with its utmost force against the new incumbent.

munication to the Conference, as reported to the Conference by the Committee on Episcopacy."

May 30th. Dr. Capers addressed the Conference at length. He said Dr. Durbin seemed deeply to deprecate involving the Church in the North in the evil of slavery by retaining Bishop Andrew in the episcopacy, but remarked that if this fact would involve the North in the evil they so much deprecated, they were already so involved by the unity of the Church and the ministry. He thanked God for this unity; but this unity stands not alone in the episcopacy. We have not only *one* episcopacy, but *one* ministry, *one* doctrine, *one* discipline; we were one in usage North and South; and in this view he was astonished to hear brethren talk of Bishop Andrew's continuance in the episcopacy as extending the evils of slavery over the North. Not one more slave or slaveholder would be made in this way. He noticed Dr. Durbin's statement that the course of concession had ever been from the North to the South, from 1784 downward. He inquired what was North and what South at that date? Dr. Durbin says the majority was then in the South. But where was that South? Methodism had not penetrated into Arkansas, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana; Georgia, or South Carolina. But we had Maryland and Virginia for the South. And where was the North? Not in New York; for it was then a slaveholding State. Not New England; for there was no Methodism there. It was evident that the brother had presented the North as making concessions to the South, when no such distinction obtained in the Church, for all were slaveholding States. He alluded to the doctrine that a Bishop is only an officer of the General Conference, and receives his whole authority by the election of that body, and none by *consecration*, and to the fact that Dr. Durbin had quoted Dr. Coke, Mr. Asbury, and Mr. Dickens, in support of this position. He said the authority was good, if the object had been to prove (what no body denied) that a Bishop was amenable to the General Conference, and might be removed for good cause; "but no authority of Mr. Asbury, Dr. Coke, Mr. Dickens, or any body else—before this case of Bishop Andrew's caused it to be asserted on this floor—can be adduced for any such doctrine." "A Bishop an officer of the General Conference merely! Then were it both untrue and blasphemous to invest him with the office, with those holy words of the consecration service. 'Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a Bishop in the Church of God, now committed to thee by the imposition of our hands, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.'" Dr. Capers closed by a powerful appeal in behalf of the slaves of the South, from which we make the following quotation:—

"I beseech brethren, to allow due weight to the considerations which have been so kindly and ably urged by others on this branch of the subject. I contemplate it, I confess, with a bleeding heart. Never, never have I suffered as in view of the evil which this measure threatens against the South. The agitation has already begun; and I tell you that though our hearts were to be torn out of our bodies, it could avail nothing, when once you awaken the feeling that we cannot be trusted among the slaves. Once you have done this thing, you have effectually destroyed us. I could wish to die sooner than live to see such a day. As sure as you live, brethren, there are tens of thousands, nay hundreds of thousands, whose destiny may be periled by your decision on this case. When we tell you that we preach to a hundred thousand slaves on our missionary fields, we only announce the beginning of our work,—the beginning openings of the door of access to the most numerous masses of slaves in the South. When we add, that there are two hundred thousand now within our reach who have no gospel unless we give it to them, it is still but the same announcement of the beginnings of the opening of that wide and effectual door, which was so long closed, and so lately has begun to be opened, for the preaching of the gospel, by our ministry, to a numerous and destitute portion of the people. O, close not this door! Shut us not out from this great work, to which we have been so signally called of God. Consider our position. I pray you, I beseech you by every sacred consideration, pause in this matter. Do not talk about concessions to the South. We ask for no concessions,—no compromises. Do with us as you please, but spare the souls for whom Jesus died. If you deem our toils too light, and that after all, there is more of rhetoric than cross-bearing in our labors, come down and take a part with us. Let this be the compromise, if we have any. I could almost promise my vote to make the elder a Bishop who should give such a proof as this of his devotion to,—I will not say the emancipation of the negro race, but what is better,—what is more constitutional and more Christian,—the salvation of the souls of the negroes on our great Southern plantations. Concessions! We ask for none. So far from it, we are ready to make any in our power to you. We come to you not for ourselves, but for perishing souls; and we entreat you for Christ's sake, not to take away from them the bread of life, which we are just now beginning to carry them. We beg for this—I must repeat it—with bleeding hearts. Yes, I feel intensely on this subject. The stone of stumbling and rock of offence, of former times, when George Daugherty, a Southern man, and a Southern minister, and one of the wisest and best that ever graced our ministry, was dragged to the pump in Charleston,

and his life rescued by a sword in a woman's hand,—the offence of the anti-slavery measures of that day has but lately begun to subside. I cannot, I say, forget past times, and the evil of them, when in those parts of my own State of South Carolina, where slaves are most numerous, there was little more charity for Methodist preachers than if they had been Mormons, and their access to the negroes was looked upon as dangerous to the public peace. Bring not back upon us the evil of those bitter days. * * * * *

“Life or death, we will never desert that Christian work to which we know God has called us. We ask to be spared no trial; but that the way of trials may be kept open for us. We ask to be spared no labor, but that we may be permitted to labor on, and still more abundantly. Add, if you please, to the amount of our toils. Pile labor on labor more and more. Demand of us still more brick; or even the full tale of brick without staw or stubble; but cut us not off from the clay also. Cut us not off from the slaves of the South, when (to say nothing of “concessions to the South,”) you shall have finished the measure of your demands for the North.”

Dr. Peck suggested the propriety of bringing the debate to a close, and Bishop Andrew begged that the question might be taken without further delay.

“A motion for the previous question having failed, Bishop Hedding requested that the Conference might not hold an afternoon session, as the Bishops wished an opportunity to consult together, with a view to fixing on a compromise. With this view, the case of Bishop Andrew was deferred until the next day.

May 31st. Bishop Waugh read the following Address of the Bishops:—

To the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church:

Reverend and Dear Brethren,—The undersigned respectfully and affectionately offer to your calm consideration the result of their consultation this afternoon in regard to the unpleasant and very delicate question which has been so long and so earnestly debated before your body. They have, with the liveliest interest, watched the progress of your discussion, and have awaited its termination with the deepest solicitude. As they have pored over this subject with anxious thought, by day and by night, they have been more and more impressed with the difficulties connected therewith, and the disastrous results which, in their apprehension, are the almost inevitable consequences of the present action on the question now pending before you. To the undersigned it is fully apparent that a decision thereon, whether affirmatively or negatively, will

most extensively disturb the peace and harmony of that widely extended brotherhood which has so effectively operated for good in the United States of America, and elsewhere, during the last sixty years, in the development of a system of active energy, of which union has always been a main element. They have with deep emotion, inquired, Can any thing be done to avoid an evil so much deprecated by every friend of our common Methodism? Long and anxiously have they awaited for a satisfactory answer to this inquiry, but they have paused in vain. At this painful crisis, they have unanimously concurred in the propriety of recommending the postponement of further action in the case of Bishop Andrew until the ensuing General Conference. It does not enter into the design of the undersigned to argue the propriety of their recommendation, otherwise strong and valid reasons might be adduced in its support. They cannot but think that if the embarrassment of Bishop Andrew should not cease before that time, the next General Conference, representing the pastors, ministers, and people of the several Annual Conferences, after all the facts in the case shall have passed in review before them, will be better qualified than the present General Conference can be to adjudicate the case wisely and discreetly. Until the cessation of the embarrassment, or the expiration of the interval between the present and ensuing General Conference, the undersigned believe that such a division of the work of the general superintendency might be made without any infraction of a constitutional principle, as would fully employ Bishop Andrew in those sections of the Church in which his presence and services would be welcome and cordial. If the course pursued on the present occasion by the undersigned be deemed novel, they persuade themselves that their justification, in view of all candid and peace-loving persons, will be found in their strong desire to prevent disunion, and to promote harmony in the Church.

Very respectfully and affectionately submitted,

JOSHUA SOULE,
ELIJAH HEDDING,
B. WAUGH,
T. A. MORRIS.

Mr. Collins moved to adopt the suggestion. Mr. Mitchell proposed that it lie on the table one day, which Mr. Collins assented to and Mr. Havens opposed.

Dr. Bangs proposed its reference to a committee, which Mr. Hamline and Dr. Olin approved, and Mr. Collins and Mr. Slicer opposed.

Mr. J. T. Peck "thought the darkness was increased, and the Conference deeper in the mire than ever." He thought the

Bishops' proposition was in effect that they should frankly confess that all they had said on the subject was wrong, give up all they had proposed to do, and leave the thing to the operation of time, when they had already refused to do so.

The case was laid over until the following day; and in the mean time it became quite obvious that Mr. Peck was not alone in his feelings of ultraism, which so promptly rejected the proposition of the Bishops, with something nearly allied to indignation. In view of the temper referred to, the Bishops thought it expedient, after the meeting of the Conference, the next morning, to define their position with respect to that paper.

Bishop Hedding "wished to withdraw his signature from the document presented yesterday. He had not been drawn or persuaded into it. But in signing it he had been governed by two reasons which he thought it his duty to present. First, he signed it as a peace measure. Second, he believed it would be generally acceptable to the Conference. In both these expectations he was disappointed. Facts had come to his knowledge which induced him to believe it would not make peace, and that it might be productive of a lengthened debate, and, instead of removing, would only increase the difficulty. He therefore wished his name to be withdrawn, but would submit if the Conference decided that he had no authority to do so." No objection was made.

Bishop Waugh said "that in regard to the same document a few remarks might not be unnecessary. He wished his name to remain, unless he saw other reasons than had yet appeared. He came into the measure without persuasion or entreaty, as the result of his own thoughts and voluntary inclination, though slowly and reluctantly. Yet it was under a train of circumstances that left him little or no option in the premises. He adopted it as a last resort, and with but little hope of success. It did, however, appear to him that it would be better to put that view before the General Conference, and let it take its course, and so far as himself was concerned, he should be perfectly satisfied with the result. He should exceedingly regret if the communication were the occasion of a protracted debate, but he hoped that would not be the case. He did not feel at liberty to withdraw his name from a paper that he designed to be for the preservation of the Church."

Bishop Morris "wished his name to remain attached to that document, as a testimony that he had done what he could to preserve the unity of the body."

Bishop Soule said, "perhaps he ought to offer a few words in connection with his colleagues, and it afforded him pleasure to receive the assurances that they were in no way influenced or persuaded to put their signatures to that paper. He ac-

knowledgeed that they went into the measure as freely and fully, and under the same conviction, as himself. Conference were aware that this matter came before the superintendents on motion. He put his signature to the document with the same views and under the same convictions as his very worthy colleagues did, and neither his views nor his convictions were changed in any way. And he wished his signature to that document to go forth through a thousand channels to the world. It is already before the American people, and I may not and will not, withdraw it."

The communication of the Bishops was taken up. Dr. Bangs moved to lay it on the table, and said he had used every effort in his power to effect a compromise, but from what had been told him by members from the *North* and *South*, not a vestige of this hope remained.

Dr. Winans said that the remark of Dr. Bangs might imply that the South were opposed to the proposition of the Bishops. This was not the case, for the Southern delegates were of one mind to entertain the proposition of compromise offered by the Bishops.

The motion to lay on the table was intended as a final rejection of the Bishops' proposition, and the vote on that motion was taken by ayes and noes. We give the vote as one of interest in the history of the case, especially as it has since then been strangely asserted that the Bishops' compromise was rejected by the South. It is therefore proper that those who voted for and against that compromise should be known. The following is the vote:—

YEAS. *New York Conference*—Bangs, Rice, G. Peck, Stratten, Sandford, F. Reed, Ferguson, Martindale, Richardson. *Providence*—Lovejoy, Upham, Benton, Townsend. *New England*—J. Porter, King, Crandall, C. Adams, Pickering. *Maine*—Hill, E. Robinson, Randall, Morse, Hobart, Nickerson, Webber. *New Hampshire*—E. Scott, Chamberlin, Kelly, Perkins, Dow, Spaulding, Cahoon, Cass. *Troy*—Seymour, Wever, Coleman, Spicer, Covell, Houghtaling, J. T. Peck. *Black River*—A. D. Peck, A. Adams, Baker, Ninde. *Oncida*—Snyder, Comfort, Rounds, Shepherd, Row, Bowen, Holmes. *Genesee*—Filmore, Lucky, Steele, Abell, Hosmer. *Erie*—Steadman, Bain, Clarke, J. Robinson, Goodwin. *Pittsburg*—W. Hunter, H. J. Clark, Spencer, S. Elliott, Boyd, Wakefield, Drummond. *Ohio*—C. Elliott, Raper, Trimble, Finley, Hamline, Connell, Ferree. *North Ohio*—E. Thompson, Power, Poe, Yocum, Runnells. *Michigan*—Crane, Billings, Baughman. *Indiana*—Simpson, Wiley, Ames, Miller, Wood, Eddy. *Rock River*—Mitchell. *Illinois*—Akers, Cartwright. *Baltimore*—Griffith. *New Jersey*—Shaw, Winner—95.

NAYS. *New York Conference*—Olin, Carpenter. *Genesee*—Hibbard, Seager, Alverson. *Ohio*—Schon. *Michigan*—G. Smith. *Indiana*—Ruter, Havens. *Rock River*—Weed, Sinclair, H. W. Reed. *Illinois*—Stamper, Vaneleve, N. G. Berryman, *Missouri*—Redman, W. Patton, J. C. Berryman, J. M. Jameson. *Kentucky*—Bascom, Gunn, Kavanaugh, Stevenson, Crouch, Brush. *Holston*—Sevier, S. Patton, T. Stringfield. *Tennessee*—R. Paine, McFerrin, Green, Maddin. *Memphis*—Harris, Moody, McMahon, Joyner. *Arkansas*—J. C. Parker, Ratcliffe, A. Hunter. *Texas*—Fowler, J. Clarke. *Mississippi*—Winans, Drake, Lane, Rogers. *Alabama*—Murrah, Boring, Garrett, Hamilton. *Georgia*—L. Pierce, G. F. Pierce, Parks, Glenn, Evans, Longstreet. *South Carolina*—Capers, Wightman, Betts, Dunwoody, Walker. *North Carolina*—J. Jamieson, Doub, Blake. *Virginia*—Early, Lee, W. A. Smith, Crowder. *Baltimore*—Slicer, Bear, Morgan, Tippet, Sargent, Collins, Gere, Hildt. *Philadelphia*—Durbin, T. J. Thompson, White, L. Scott, W. Cooper, I. T. Cooper. *New Jersey*—J. S. Porter, Neal, Sovereign—84.

The Bishops' compromise was therefore laid on the table, or rejected, and the resolution of Mr. Finley again taken up, and carried by a vote of 111 to 69. The ayes and noes on the final vote stood as follows:—

YEAS. *New York Conference*—Nathan Bangs, Stephen Olin, Phineas Rice, George Peck, John B. Stratten, Peter P. Sandford, Fitch Reed, Samuel D. Ferguson, Stephen Martindale, Marvin Richardson. *Troy*—Truman Seymour, John M. Wever, James Covel, jun., Tobias Spicer, Seymour Coleman, James B. Houghtaling, Jesse T. Peck. *Providence*—J. Lovejoy, F. Upham, S. Benton, Paul Townsend. *New Hampshire*—Elihu Scott, J. Perkins, Samuel Kelley, S. Chamberlain, John G. Dow, J. Spaulding, C. D. Cahoon, William D. Cass. *New England*—J. Porter, D. S. King, P. Crandall, C. Adams, G. Pickering. *Pittsburg*—William Hunter, H. J. Clark, J. Spencer, S. Elliott, R. Boyd, S. Wakefield, J. Drummond. *Maine*—M. Hill, E. Robinson, D. B. Randall, C. W. Morse, J. Hobart, Heman Nickerson, G. Webber. *Black River*—A. D. Peck, A. Adams, G. Baker, W. W. Ninde. *Eric*—J. J. Steadman, John Bain, G. W. Clarke, J. Robinson, T. Goodwin. *Oneida*—J. M. Snyder, S. Comfort, N. Rounds, D. A. Shepherd, H. F. Row, E. Bowen, D. Holmes, jun. *Michigan*—E. Crane, A. Billings, J. A. Baughman. *Rock River*—B. Weed, H. W. Reed, J. T. Mitchell. *Genesee*—G. Filmore, S. Luckey, A. Steele, F. G. Hibbard, S. Seager, A. Abell, W. Hosmer, J. B. Alverson. *North Ohio*—E. Thompson, J. H. Power, A. Poe, E. Yocum, W. Runnells. *Illinois*—P. Akers, P. Cartwright. *Ohio*—C. Elliott, William H. Raper, J. M. Trimble, J. B. Finley, L. L.

Hamline, Z. Connell, J. Ferree. *Indiana*—M. Simpson, A. Wiley, E. R. Ames, J. Miller, C. W. Ruter, A. Wood, A. Eddy, J. Havens. *Texas*—J. Clark. *Baltimore*—J. A. Collins, A. Griffith, J. Bear, N. J. B. Morgan, J. Davis. *Philadelphia*—J. P. Durbin, L. Scott. *New Jersey*—I. Winner, J. S. Porter, J. K. Shaw—111.

NAYS. *New York Conference*—C. W. Carpenter. *Michigan*—G. Smith. *Rock River*—J. Sinclair. *Illinois*—J. Stamper, J. Van Cleve, N. G. Berryman. *Kentucky*—H. B. Bascom, W. Gunn, H. H. Kavanaugh, E. Stevenson, B. T. Crouch, G. W. Brush. *Ohio*—E. W. Sehon. *Holston*—E. F. Sevier, S. Patten, T. Stringfield. *Tennessee*—R. Paine, J. B. McFerrin, A. L. P. Green, T. Maddin. *Missouri*—W. W. Redman, W. Patten, J. C. Berryman, J. M. Jameson. *North Carolina*—J. Jamieson, Peter Doub, B. T. Blake. *Memphis*—G. W. D. Harris, S. S. Moody, William M'Mahon, T. Joyner. *Arkansas*—J. C. Parker, W. P. Ratcliffe, A. Hunter. *Virginia*—J. Early, T. Crowder, W. A. Smith, L. M. Lee. *Mississippi*—William Winans, B. M. Drake, J. Lane, G. M. Rogers. *Texas*—L. Fowler. *Alabama*—J. Boring, J. Hamilton, William Murrah, G. Garrett. *Georgia*—G. F. Pierce, W. J. Parks, L. Pierce, J. W. Glenn, J. E. Evans, A. B. Longstreet. *South Carolina*—William Capers, W. M. Wightman, C. Betts, S. Dunwody, H. A. C. Walker. *Baltimore*—H. Slicer, J. A. Gere, T. B. Sargent, C. B. Tippet, G. Hildt. *Philadelphia*—T. J. Thompson, H. White, W. Cooper, I. T. Cooper. *New Jersey*—Thomas Neal, Thomas Sovereign—69.

Dr. L. Pierce gave notice that the Southern delegates would, at their earliest convenience, present their protest against the action of the Conference in this case, to be entered on the journal.

June 3rd. The following resolutions were offered by Mr. Slicer and Mr. Sargent, of the Baltimore Conference:—

“*Resolved*, That it is the sense of this General Conference, that the vote of Saturday last in the case of Bishop Andrew be understood as advisory only, and not in the light of a judicial mandate.

“*Resolved*, That the final disposition of Bishop Andrew's case be postponed until the General Conference of 1848, in conformity with the suggestion of the Bishops in their address to the Conference on Friday, May 31st.

“H. SLICER,
“T. B. SARGENT.”

These resolutions were laid on the table by ayes 75, noes 68; the North, with individual exceptions, voting for laying on the table, and the South unanimously against it.

The following series of resolutions were offered by Dr. Capers:—

“Be it resolved, by the delegates of the Annual Conferences in General Conference assembled, That we recommend to the Annual Conferences, to suspend the constitutional restrictions which limit the powers of the General Conference, so far, and only so far, as to allow of the following alterations in the government of the Church, viz.:—

“1. That the Methodist Episcopal Church, in these United States and Territories, and the republic of Texas, shall constitute two General Conferences, to meet quadrennially, the one at some place *South*, and the other *North* of the line which now divides between the States commonly designated as free States, and those in which slavery exists.

“2. That each one of the two General Conferences thus constituted, shall have full powers, (under the limitations and restrictions which are now of force and binding on the General Conference,) to make rules and regulations for the Church, within their limits, respectively, and to elect Bishops for the same.

“3. That the two General Conferences, aforesaid, shall severally have jurisdiction, as follows:—The Southern General Conference shall comprehend the States of Virginia, Kentucky, and Missouri, and the States and Territories lying southwardly thereto, and also the republic of Texas; to be known and designated by the title of the ‘Southern General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States.’ And the Northern General Conference, to comprehend all those States and Territories lying North of the States of Virginia, Kentucky, and Missouri, as above mentioned, and to be known and designated by the title of the ‘Northern General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States.’

“4. And be it further resolved, That as soon as three fourths of all the members of the Annual Conferences voting on these resolutions shall approve the same, the said Southern and Northern General Conferences shall be deemed as having been constituted by such approval; and it shall be competent for the Southern Annual Conferences to elect delegates to said General Conference, to meet in the city of Nashville, Tenn., on the 1st day of May, 1848, or sooner, if a majority of two thirds of the members of the Annual Conferences composing that General Conference shall desire the same.

“5. And be it further resolved, as aforesaid, That the Book Concerns at New York and Cincinnati, shall be held and conducted as the property, and for the benefit, of all the Annual Conferences, as heretofore:—the editors and agents to be elected once in four years, at the time of the session of the Northern

General Conference; and the votes of the Southern General Conference to be cast by delegates of that Conference attending the Northern for that purpose.

"6. And be it further resolved, That our Church organization for foreign missions shall be maintained and conducted jointly between the two General Conferences, as one Church, in such manner as shall be agreed upon from time to time between the two great branches of the Church as represented in the said two Conferences."

The resolutions were, on motion of Dr. Bangs, referred to a select committee, consisting of Messrs. Capers, Winans, Crowder, Porter, Filmore, Akers, Hamline, Davis and Sandford.

June 5th. Dr. Capers, from the above committee, reported that "they could not agree on a report which they judged would be acceptable to the Conference."

Dr. Longstreet, in behalf of the Southern and South-western Conferences, presented the following Declaration:—

"The delegates of the Conferences in the slaveholding States, take leave to declare to the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, that the continued agitation of the subject of slavery and abolition in a portion of the Church,—the frequent action on that subject in the General Conference,—and especially the extra-judicial proceedings against Bishop Andrew, which resulted, on Saturday last, in the virtual suspension of him from his office as superintendent,—must produce a state of things in the South which renders a continuance of the jurisdiction of that General Conference over these Conferences inconsistent with the success of the ministry in the slaveholding States. (Signed,)

"*Virginia Conference.*—John Early, W. A. Smith, Thomas Crowder, Leroy M. Lee.

"*Kentucky.*—H. B. Bascom, William Gunn, H. H. Kavanaugh, Edward Stevenson, B. T. Crouch, G. W. Brush.

"*Missouri.*—W. W. Redman, William Patton, J. C. Berryman, J. M. Jameson.

"*Holston.*—E. F. Sevier, S. Patton, Thomas Stringfield.

"*Georgia.*—G. F. Pierce, William J. Parks, L. Pierce, J. W. Glenn, J. E. Evans, A. B. Longstreet.

"*North Carolina.*—James Jamieson, Peter Doub, B. T. Blake.

"*Illinois.*—J. Stamper.

"*Memphis.*—G. W. D. Harris, Wm. McMahon, Thomas Joyner, S. S. Moody.

"*Arkansas.*—John C. Parker, William P. Ratcliffe, Andrew Hunter.

"*Mississippi.*—Wm. Winans, B. M. Drake, John Lane, G. M. Rogers.

"*Texas.*—Littleton Fowler.

"*Alabama*.—Jesse Boring, Jefferson Hamilton, W. Murrah, G. Garrett.

"*Tennessee*.—Robert Paine, John B. McFerrin, A. L. P. Green, T. Maddin.

"*South Carolina*.—William Capers, William M. Wightman, Charles Betts, S. Dunwody, H. A. C. Walker."

After the reading of the paper, Dr. Elliott proposed its reference to a committee of nine.

Mr. Sandford said the declaration charged *extra-judicial* action on the Conference; this he considered untrue, and an insult to the Conference, and that therefore the paper ought not to be entertained.

Dr. Longstreet explained the meaning of *extra-judicial* proceedings, and showed that the action in this case was truly of that character, and nothing in the nature of insult was intended or legitimately embraced in the paper. The Southern delegates simply expressed the opinion that it was no longer desirable that that General Conference should have *jurisdiction* over them.

Dr. Olin spoke of the action in Bishop Andrew's case, and said, had he regarded it as *judicial* or *punitive*, he would not have voted for it. He said he would embody his sentiments in the form of resolutions, and submitted the following, upon which however no action was taken:—

"*Resolved*, That this Conference does not consider its action in the case of Bishop Andrew as either judicial or punitive, but as a prudential regulation for the security and welfare of the Church.

"*Resolved*, That having made a solemn declaration of what, in their judgment, the safety and peace of the Church require, it is not necessary or proper to express any opinion as to what amount of respect may justly belong to their action in the premises."

The Declaration was then referred to a committee, agreeably to Dr. Elliott's proposition, and Messrs. Paine, Filmore, Akers, Bangs, Crowder, Sargent, Winans, Hamline, and Porter, were appointed that committee.

The following resolution of instruction to the committee was adopted:—

"*Resolved*, That the committee appointed to take into consideration the communication of the delegates from the Southern Conferences be instructed, provided they cannot in their judgment devise a plan for an amicable adjustment of the difficulties now existing in the Church, on the subject of slavery, to devise, if possible, a constitutional plan for a mutual and friendly division of the Church.

"J. B. McFERRIN,
"TOBIAS SPICER."

Some of the Southern brethren fearing the question of jurisdictional division might be embarrassed, if not defeated, by the introduction of constitutional scruples, it was moved by Mr. Crowder, of Virginia, to amend the instruction by striking out of it the word "*constitutional*;" but the Conference resolved to have a *constitutional division*, or none, and accordingly refused to amend as proposed, but passed the instruction as originally offered. So the committee were instructed to confine their action to constitutional principles.

June 6th. The Protest of the Southern delegates against the action of the General Conference in the case of Bishop Andrew, was introduced and read by Dr. Bascom, as follows:—

PROTEST.

"In behalf of thirteen Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and portions of the ministry and membership of several other Conferences, embracing nearly five thousand ministers, traveling and local, and a membership of nearly five hundred thousand, constitutionally represented in this General Conference, we the undersigned, a minority of the delegates of the several Annual Conferences in General Conference assembled, after mature reflection, impelled by convictions we cannot resist, and in conformity with the rights and usages of minorities, in the instance of deliberative assemblies and judicial tribunals, in similar circumstances of division and disagreement, *Do most solemnly, and in due form, protest* against the recent act of a majority of this General Conference, in an attempt, as understood by the minority, to degrade and punish the Rev. James O. Andrew, one of the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, by declaring it to be the sense or judgment of the General Conference that he desist from the exercise of his episcopal functions, without the exhibition of any alleged offence against the laws or discipline of the Church, without form of trial, or legal conviction of any kind, and in the absence of any charge of want of qualification or faithfulness in the performance of the duties pertaining to his office.

"We protest against the act of the majority in the case of Bishop Andrew, as extra-judicial to all intents and purposes, being both without law and contrary to law. We *protest* against the act because we recognize in this General Conference no right, power, or authority, ministerial, judicial or administrative, to suspend or depose a Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, or otherwise subject him to any official disability whatever, without the formal presentation of a charge or charges, alleging that the Bishop to be dealt with has been guilty of the violation of some law, or at least some disciplinary obligation of the Church, and also upon conviction of such

charge after due form of trial. *We protest* against the act in question as a violation of the fundamental law, usually known as the compromise law of the Church, on the subject of slavery—the only law which can be brought to bear upon the case of Bishop Andrew, and the assertion and maintenance of which, until it is constitutionally revoked, is guaranteed by the honor and good faith of this body, as the representative assembly of the thirty-three Annual Conferences known as contracting parties in the premises.

“And we protest against the act further, as an attempt to establish a dangerous precedent, subversive of the union and stability of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and especially as placing in jeopardy the general superintendency of the Church, by subjecting any Bishop of the Church at any time to the will and caprice of a majority of the General Conference, not only without law, but in defiance of the restraints and provisions of law. The undersigned, a minority of the General Conference, in *protesting*, as they do, against the late act of the majority, in the virtual suspension of Bishop Andrew, regard it as due to themselves and those they represent, as well as the character and interests of the Church at large, to declare, by solemn and formal avowal, that after a careful examination of the entire subject, in all its relations and bearings, they protest as above, for the reasons and upon the grounds following, viz., 1st. The proceeding against Bishop Andrew in this General Conference has been upon the assumption that he is connected with slavery—that he is the legal holder and owner of slave property. On the subject of slavery in the Methodist Episcopal Church, both as it regards the ministry and membership, we have special law, upon which the adjudication of all questions of slavery must, by intention of law, proceed. The case of Bishop Andrew, therefore, presents a simple question of law and fact, and the undersigned cannot consent that the force of circumstances and other merely extrinsic considerations shall be allowed to lead to any issue, except that indicated by the law and the facts in the case. In the late act of the majority, law, express law, is appealed from, and expediency in view of circumstances—relative propriety—assumed necessity, is substituted in its place as a rule of judgment. It is assumed, and the assumption acted upon, that expediency may have jurisdiction even in the presence of law—the law, too, being special, and covering the case, in terms. In the absence of law, it might be competent for the General Conference to act upon other grounds; this is not disputed, nor yet that it would have been competent for the Conference to proceed upon the forms of law—but that the terms and conditions of a special enactment, having all the force of a common public charter, can be

rightfully waived in practice, at the promptings of a fugitive unsettled expediency, is a position the undersigned regard, not merely as erroneous, but as fraught with danger to the best interests of the Church.

“The law of the Church on slavery has always existed since 1785, but especially since 1804, and in view of the adjustment of the whole subject, in 1816, as a *virtual, though informal, contract of mutual concession and forbearance*, between the North and the South, then, as now, known and existing in distinct parties, in relation to the vexed questions of slavery and abolition. Those conferences found in States where slavery prevailed constituting the Southern party, and those in the non-slaveholding States the Northern, exceptions to the rule being found in both. The rights of the legal owners of slaves, in all the slaveholding States, are guarantied by the constitution of the United States, and by the local constitutions of the States respectively, as the supreme law of the land, to which every minister and member of the Methodist Episcopal Church within the limits of the United States government professes subjection, and pledges himself to submit, as an article of Christian faith, in the common creed of the Church. Domestic slavery, therefore, wherever it exists in this country, is a civil regulation, existing under the highest sanctions of constitutional and municipal law, known to the tribunals of the country, and it has always been assumed, at the South, and relied upon as correct, that the North or non-slaveholding States, had no right, civil or moral, to interfere with relations and interests thus secured to the people of the South by all the graver forms of law and social order, and that it cannot be done without an abuse of the constitutional rights of citizenship. The people of the North, however, have claimed to think differently, and have uniformly acted toward the South in accordance with such opposition of opinion. Precisely in accordance, too, with this state of things, as it regards the general population of the North and South respectively, the Methodist Episcopal Church has been divided in opinion and feeling on the subject of slavery and abolition, since its organization in 1784; two separate and distinct parties have always existed. The Southern Conferences, in agreeing to the main principles of the compromise law in 1804 and 1816, conceded by express stipulation their right to resist Northern interference in any form, upon the condition, pledged by the North, that while the *whole Church*, by common consent, united in proper effort for the mitigation and final removal of the evil of slavery, the North was not to interfere, by excluding from membership or ministerial office in the Church, persons owning and holding slaves in States where emancipation is not practicable, and where the liberated slave is not permitted to enjoy

freedom. Such was the compact of 1804 and 1816, finally agreed to by the parties after a long and fearful struggle, and such is the compact now—the proof being derived from history and the testimony of living witnesses. And is it possible to suppose that the original purpose and intended application of the law was not designed to embrace every member, minister, order, and officer of the Methodist Episcopal Church? Is the idea of excepted cases allowable by a fair construction of the law? Do not the reasons and intendment of the law place it beyond doubt, that every conceivable case of alleged misconduct that can arise, connected with slavery or abolition, is to be subjected by consent and contract of parties to the jurisdiction of this great conservative arrangement?

“Is there any thing in the law or its reasons creating an exception in the instance of Bishops? Would the South have entered into the arrangement, or in any form consented to the law, had it been intimated by the North that Bishops must be an exception to the rule? Are the virtuous dead of the North to be slandered by the supposition that they intended to except Bishops, and thus accomplished their purposes, in negotiation with the South, by a resort to deceptive and dishonorable means? If Bishops are not named, no more are presiding elders, agents, editors—or indeed any other officers of the Church, who are nevertheless included, although the same rule of construction would except them also. The enactment was for an entire people, East, West, North, and South. It was for the Church, and every member of it—for the common weal of the body—and is therefore universal and unrestricted in its application; and no possible case can be settled upon any other principles, without a direct violation of this law, both in fact and form. The law being what we have assumed, any violation of it, whatever may be its form or mode, is as certainly a breach of good faith as an infringement of law. It must be seen, from the manner in which the compromise was effected, in the shape of a law, agreed to by equal contracting parties, “the several Annual Conferences,” after long and formal negotiation, that it was not a mere legislative enactment, a simple decree of a General Conference, but partakes of the nature of a grave compact, and is invested with all the sacredness and sanctions of a solemn treaty, binding respectively the well-known parties to its terms and stipulations. If this be so, —and with the evidence accessible who can doubt it?—if this be so, will it prove a light matter for this General Conference to violate or disregard the obligation of this *legal compromise*, in the shape of public recognized law? Allow that the present parties in this controversy cannot be brought to view the subject of the law in question in the same light, can such a matter end

in a mere difference of opinion as it respects the immediate parties? The law exists in the Discipline of the Church. The law is known, and its reasons are known, as equally binding upon both parties, and what is the likelihood of the imputation of bad faith under the circumstances? What the hazard, that such imputation, as the decision of public opinion, it may be from a thousand tribunals, will be brought to bear, with all the light and force of conviction, upon any act of this body, in violation of the plain provisions of long-established law, originating in treaty, and based upon the principles of *conventional compromise*?

“In proportion to our love of truth, of law, and order, are we not called upon to pause and weigh well the hazard, before, as a General Conference, we incur it beyond change or remedy? The undersigned have looked to the great *conservative law* of the Discipline on the subject of slavery and abolition, as the only charter of *connectional union* between the North and the South; and whenever this bond of connection is rendered null and void, no matter in what form, or by what means, they are compelled to regard the Church, to all practical purpose, as already divided without the intervention of any other agency. By how far, therefore, they look upon the union of the Methodist Episcopal Church as essential to its prosperity, and the glory and success of American Methodism, by so far they are bound to *protest* against the late act of the General Conference in the irregular suspension of Bishop Andrew, as not only without law, but in direct contravention of legal stipulations known to be essential to the unity of the Church. And they are thus explicit in a statement of facts, that the responsibility of division may attach where in justice it belongs. The minority making this protest are perfectly satisfied with the law of the Church affecting slavery and abolition. They ask no change. They need—they seek no indulgence in behalf of the South. Had Bishop Andrew been suspended according to law, after due form of trial, they would have submitted without remonstrance, as the friends of law and order.

“*They except and protest further*, against the lawless procedure, as they think, in the case of Bishop Andrew, because, apart from the injustice done him and the South, by the act, other and graver difficulties necessarily incidental to this movement come in for a share of attention. The whole subject is, in the very nature of things, resolved into a single original question. Will the General Conference adhere to, and in good faith assert and maintain the compromise law of the Church on the vexed question dividing us—or will it be found expedient generally, as in the case of Bishop Andrew, to lay it aside and tread it under foot? No question on the subject of slavery and abolition

can be settled until the General Conference shall settle *this* beyond the possibility of evasion. In the present crisis, it is the opinion of the undersigned, that every Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and every member of this General Conference, is especially called upon by all the responsibilities of truth and honor to declare himself upon the subject, and they deem it proper, respectfully and urgently, to make such call a part of this protest. When so much depends upon it, can the General Conference, as the organ of the supreme authority of the Church, remain silent without incurring the charge of trifling both with its interests and reputation? Law always pledges the public faith of the body ostensibly governed by it to the faithful assertion and performance of its stipulations, and the compromise law of the Discipline, partaking as it does of the nature of the law of treaty, and embracing, as has been seen, all possible cases, pledges the good faith of every minister and member of the Methodist Episcopal Church against saying or doing any thing tending to annul the force or thwart the purposes of its enactment. The only allowable remedy of those who object to the law is to seek a constitutional change of the law, and in failure to submit, or else retire from the Church. All attempts to resist, evade, or defeat the objects and intended application of the law, until duly revoked, must be regarded as unjust and revolutionary, because an invasion of well-defined conventional right. And the undersigned except to the course of the majority in the informal prosecution of Bishop Andrew and the anomalous quasi suspension it inflicts, as not only giving to the compromise a construction rendering it entirely ineffectual, but as being directly subversive of the great bond of union which has held the North and South together for the last forty years. Turning to the confederating Annual Conferences of 1804, and the vexed and protracted negotiations which preceded the General Conference of that year, and finally resulted in the existing law of the Discipline, regulating the whole subject, and glancing at nearly half a million of Methodists, now in the South, who have come into the Church with all their hopes and fears, interests and associations, their property, character, and influence, reposing in safety upon the publicly pledged faith of the Methodist Episcopal Church, only to be told that this is all a dream, that a part of what was pledged was never intended to be allowed, and that the whole is at all times subject to the discretion of a dominant majority, claiming, in matter of right, to be without and above law, competent not merely to make all rules and regulations for the proper government of the Church, but to govern the Church without rule or regulation, and punish and degrade without even the alleged infringement of law, or the form of trial, if

it be thought expedient, presents a state of things filling the undersigned with alarm and dismay. Such views and facts, without adducing others, will perhaps be sufficient to show the first and principal ground occupied by the minority in the protest. They cannot resist the conviction that the majority have failed to redeem the pledge of public law given to the Church and the world by the Methodist Episcopal Church.

“2d. The undersigned are aware that it is affirmed by some of the majority, but meanwhile denied by others, and thus a mooted and unsettled question among themselves, that the resolution censuring and virtually suspending Bishop Andrew, as understood by the minority, is mere matter of advice or recommendation; but so far from advising or recommending any thing, the language of the resolution, by fair and necessary construction, is imperative and mandatory in form, and, unqualified by any thing in the resolution itself, or in the preamble explaining it, conveys the idea plainly and most explicitly, that it is the judgment and will of the Conference that Bishop Andrew shall cease to exercise the office of Bishop until he shall cease to be the owner of slaves. ‘Resolved, That it is the sense of this Conference that he desist.’ That is, having rendered himself unacceptable to the majority, it is their judgment that he retire from the bench of Bishops, and their field of action.

“No idea of request, advice, or recommendation, is conveyed by the language of the preamble or resolution, and the recent avowal of an intention to advise is, in the judgment of the undersigned, disowned by the very terms in which, it is said, the *advice* was given. The whole argument of the majority, during a debate of twelve days, turned upon the right of the Conference to displace Bishop Andrew without resort to formal trial. No one questioned the legal right of the Conference to advise; and if this only was intended, why the protracted debate upon the subject? But further, a resolution respectfully and affectionately requesting the Bishop to resign had been laid aside, to entertain the substitute under notice; a motion too to declare the resolution advisory was promptly rejected by the majority; and in view of all these facts, and the *entire* proceedings of the majority in the case, the undersigned have been compelled to consider the resolution as mandatory judgment, to the effect that Bishop Andrew desist from the exercise of his episcopal functions. If the majority have been misunderstood, the language of their own resolution, and the position they occupied in debate, have led to the misconception; and truth and honor, not less than a most unfortunate use of language, require that they explain themselves.

“3d. We except to the act of the majority, because it is

assumed that conscience and principle are involved, and require the act complained of, as expedient and necessary under the circumstances. Bishop Andrew being protected by the law of the Church, having cognizance of all offences connected with slavery, such connection in his case, in the judgment of all jurisprudence, can only be wrong in proportion as the law is bad and defective. It is not conceived by the minority, how conscience and principle can be brought to bear upon Bishop Andrew, and not upon the *law* and the *Church* having such law. They are obliged to believe that the law and the source from which it emanates must become the object of exception and censure before Bishop Andrew, who has not offended against either, unless the Church is against the law, can be subjected to trial at the bar of the conscience and principles of men who profess subjection and approval, in the instance both of the law and the Church.

“The undersigned can never consent, while we have a plain law, obviously covering an assumed offence, that the offence shall be taken, under plea of principle, out of the hands of the law, and be re-subjected to the conflicting opinions and passions which originally led to a resort to law, as the only safe standard of judgment. They do not understand how conscience and principle can attach grave blame to action, not disapproved by law—express law too, made and provided in the case—without extending condemnation to the law itself, and the body from which it proceeds. The Church can hardly be supposed to have settled policy and invariable custom, in contravention of law; the avowal of such custom and policy therefore, excluding from the episcopacy any and every man, in any way connected with slavery, is mere *assumption*. No contract, agreement, decree, or purpose of this kind, is of record, or ever existed. No such exaction, in terms or by implication, was ever made by the North, or conceded by the South. No conventional understanding ever existed to this effect, so far as the South is concerned, or has been informed. That it has long, perhaps always, been the purpose of the North, not to elect a slaveholder to the office of Bishop, is admitted. But as no law gave countenance to any thing of the kind, the South regarded it as a mere matter of social injustice, and was not disposed to complain. The North has always found its security in numbers, and the untrammelled right of suffrage, and to this the South has not objected. The assumption, however, is entirely different, and is not admitted by the South, but is plainly negatived by the law and language of the Discipline, as explained by authority of the General Conference.

“No such concession, beyond peaceable submission to the right of suffrage, exercised by the majority, will ever be sub-

mitted to by the South, as it would amount to denial of equal abstract right, and a disfranchisement of the Southern ministry, and could not be submitted to without injury and degradation. If, then, the North is not satisfied with the negative right conceded to the South by law in this matter, the minority would be glad to know what *principle* or *policy* is likely to introduce beyond the existing provisions of law. As the contingency which has occasioned the difficulty in the case of Bishop Andrew, and to which every Southern minister is liable at any time, does not, and cannot fall under the *condemnation* of existing law, and he cannot be punished, nor yet subjected to any official disability, without an abuse of both right and power, on the part of this General Conference, the minority are compelled to think that the majority ought to be satisfied with the consciousness and declaration, that they are in no way responsible for the contingency, and thus, at least, allow Bishop Andrew the benefit of their own legislation, until they see proper to change it. This attempt by the majority to protect a lawless prosecution from merited rebuke, by an appeal to conscience and principle, condemning Bishop Andrew, while the law and the Church, shielding him from the assault, are not objected to, is looked upon by the minority as a species of moral, we will not say legal casuistry, utterly subversive of all the principles of order and good government.

“4th. The act of the majority was ostensibly resorted to, because, as alleged, the Church in the middle and Northern Conferences will not submit to any, the slightest connection with slavery. But if connection with slavery is ruinous to the Church in the North, that ruin is already wrought. Who does not know that the very Discipline, laws, and legislation of the Church necessarily connect us all with slavery? All our provisional legislation on the subject has proceeded on the assumption that slavery is an element of society—a principle of action—a household reality in the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States. It is part and parcel of the economy of American Methodism, in every subjective sense. It has given birth to law and right, conventional arrangements, numerous missions, and official trusts. Every Bishop, every minister, every member of the Church is of necessity connected with slavery. Each is brother and co-member, both with slave and master, by the very laws and organization of the Church.

“If, then, connection with slavery is so disastrous, the only remedy is to purify the Church by re-organization, or get out of it as soon as possible. And would not this aversion to slavery—would not conscience and principle, so much plead in this controversy, appear much more consistent in every view of the subject in striking at the root of the evil, in the organic struc-

ture of the Church, than in seeking its personification in Bishop Andrew, protected although he be by law, and proceeding to punish him, by way of calling off attention from the known toleration of the same thing, in other aspects and relations?

“Impelled by conscience and principle to the illegal arrest of a Bishop, because he has incidentally, by bequest, inheritance, and marriage, come into possession of slave property, in no instance intending to possess himself of such property, how long will conscience and principle leave other ministers, or even lay members undisturbed, who may happen to be in the same category with Bishop Andrew? Will assurances be given that the lawlessness of expediency, controlled, as in such case it must be, by prejudice and passion, will extend no further—that there shall be no further curtailment of right as it regards the Southern ministry? Yet what is the security of the South in the case? Is the public faith of this body, as instanced in the recent violations of the compromise law, to be relied upon as the guaranty for the redemption of the pledge? What would such pledge or assurance be but to remind the South that any departure at all from the great conservative pledge of law, to which we appeal, was much more effectively guarded against originally, than it is possible to guard against any subsequent infringement, and to make the South feel further that disappointment in the first instance must compel distrust with regard to the future? The Church having specific law on the subject, all questions involving slavery must inevitably, by intention of law, come within the purview of such special provision, and cannot be judged of by any other law or standard, without a most daring departure from all the rules and sobrieties of judicial procedure, and the undersigned accordingly except to the action of the majority in relation to Bishop Andrew, as not only without sanction of law, but in conflict with rights created by law.

“5th. As the Methodist Episcopal Church is now organized, and according to its organization since 1784, the episcopacy is a co-ordinate branch, the executive department proper of the government. A Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church is not a mere creature—is in no prominent sense an officer of the General Conference. The General Conference, as such, cannot constitute a Bishop. It is true, the Annual Conferences select the Bishops of their Church, by the suffrages of their delegates, in General Conference assembled, but the General Conference in its capacity of a representative body or any other in which it exists, does not possess the power of ordination, without which a Bishop cannot be constituted.

“The Bishops are beyond a doubt an integral constituent part of the General Conference, made such by law and the

constitution; and because elected by the General Conference, it does not follow that they are subject to the will of that body, except in conformity with legal right and the provisions of law, in the premises. In this sense, and so viewed, they are subject to the General Conference, and this is sufficient limitation of their power, unless the government itself is to be considered irregular and unbalanced in the co-ordinate relations of its parts. In a sense by no means unimportant the General Conference is as much the creature of the episcopacy, as the Bishops are the creatures of the General Conference. Constitutionally the Bishops alone have the right to fix the time of holding the Annual Conferences, and should they refuse or neglect to do so, no Annual Conference could meet, according to law, and, by consequence, no delegates could be chosen, and no General Conference could be chosen, or even exist. And because this is so, what would be thought of the impertinent pretension, should the episcopacy claim that the General Conference is the mere creature of their will? As *executive officers* as well as *pastoral overseers*, the Bishops belong to the Church as such, and not to the General Conference as one of its counsels or organs of action merely.

“The General Conference is in no sense the Church, not even representatively. It is merely the representative organ of the Church, with limited powers to do business, in the discharge of a delegated trust.

“Because Bishops are in part constituted by the General Conference, the power of removal does not follow. Episcopacy even in the Methodist Church, is not a mere appointment to labor. It is an official consecrated station, under the protection of law, and can only be dangerous as the law is bad, or the Church corrupt. The power to appoint does not necessarily involve the power to remove; and when the appointing power is derivative, as in the case of the General Conference, the power of removal does not accrue at all, unless by consent of the co-ordinate branches of the government, expressed by law, made and provided in the case. When the Legislature of a State, to appeal to analogy for illustration, appoints a Judge or Senator in Congress, does the Judge or Senator thereby become the officer or creature of the Legislature, or is he the officer or senatorial representative of the State, of which the Legislature is the mere organ? And does the power of removal follow that of appointment? The answer is negative, in both cases, and applies equally to the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, who, instead of being the officers and creatures of the General Conference, are *de facto* the officers and servants of the Church, chosen by the General Conference, as its organ of action, and no right of removal accrues, except as they fail to

accomplish the *aims* of the Church in their appointment, and then only in accordance with the provisions of law. But when a Bishop is suspended, or informed that it is the wish or will of the General Conference that he cease to perform the functions of Bishop, for doing what the law of the same body allows him to do, and of course without incurring the hazard of punishment, or even blame, then the whole procedure becomes an outrage upon justice, as well as law.

“The assumption of power by the General Conference beyond the warrant of law, to which we object, and against which we protest, will lead, if carried into practice, to a direct violation of one of the restrictive rules of the constitution. Suppose it had been the ‘sense’ of this General Conference, when the late communication from the Bishops was respectfully submitted to the Conference, that such communication was an interference with their rights and duties—an attempt to tamper with the purity and independence, and therefore an outrage upon the claims and dignity of the Conference not to be borne with. And proceeding a step further, suppose it had been the ‘sense’ of the Conference that they *all* desist from performing the functions of Bishops until the ‘impediment’ of such offence had been removed—assume this, (and so far as mere law is concerned, no law being violated in either case, it was just as likely as the movement against Bishop Andrew,) and had it taken place, what had become of the general superintendency? If a Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church may, without law, and at the instance of mere party expediency, be suspended from the exercise of the appropriate functions of his office, for one act, he may for another. Admit this doctrine, and by what tenure do the Bishops hold office? One thing is certain, whatever other tenure there may be, they do not hold office *according to law*.

“The provisions of law and the faithful performance of duty, upon this theory of official tenure, afford no security. Admit this claim of absolutism, as regards right and power on the part of the General Conference, and the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church are slaves, and men constituting this body their masters and holders. They are in office only at the discretion of a majority of the General Conference, without the restraints or protection of law. Both the law and themselves are liable and likely at any time to be overborne and trampled upon together, as exemplified in the case of Bishop Andrew. If the doctrine against which we protest be admitted, the episcopal office is, at best, but a quadrennial term of service, and the undersigned are compelled to think that the man who would *remain* a Bishop, or allow himself to be *made one*, under such circumstances, ‘desires a good work,’

and is prepared for *self-sacrifice*, quite beyond the comprehension of ordinary piety.

“As it regards Bishop Andrew, if it shall be made to appear that the action in his case was intended only to *advise* and *request* him to desist from his office, it does not in any way affect the real or relative character of the movement. When a body claiming the right to compel, asks the resignation of an officer, the request is to all official and moral purposes *compulsory*, as it loads the officer with disability, and gives notice of assumed unworthiness, if not criminality. The request has all the force of a mandate, inasmuch as the officer is by such request compelled either to resign or remain in office contrary to the known will of the majority. A simple request, therefore, under the circumstances supposed, carries with it all the force of a decree, and is so understood, it is believed, by all the world.

“To request Bishop Andrew to resign, therefore, in view of all the facts and relations of the case, was, in the judgment of the minority, to punish and degrade him; and they maintain that the whole movement was without authority of law, is hence of necessity null and void, and therefore not binding upon Bishop Andrew, or the minority protesting against it.

“6th. We protest against the act of the majority, instructing Bishop Andrew to desist from the exercise of his office, not merely on account of the injustice and evil connecting with the act itself, but because the act must be understood as the exponent of principles and purposes, as it regards the union of the North and South in the Methodist Episcopal Church, well nigh destroying all hope of its perpetuity. The true position of the parties in relation to a long existing conventional arrangement, on the subject of slavery and abolition, has been fully under notice; and when men of years and wisdom, experience and learning—men of no common weight of character, and with a well earned aristocracy of Church influence thrown about them, assume and declare, in action as well as in debate, that what a plain law of the Church—the only law applicable in the case—sustained and enforced, too, by an explanatory decree of this body, at a previous session *decides*—shall *not* be a disqualification for office, of any grade, in the ministry—when such men, the law and decision of the General Conference notwithstanding, are heard declaring that what law provides for and protects nevertheless *always has been* and *always shall be* a disqualification, what further evidence is wanting to show that the *compromise basis of union*, from which the South has never swerved, has been abandoned both by the Northern and middle Conferences, with a few exceptions in the latter, and that principles and purposes are entertained by the majority, driving the South to extreme action, in defence

both of their rights and reputation? And how far the long train of eventful sequences, attendant upon the threatened result of division, may be traceable to the Northern and middle Conferences, by the issue thus provoked, is a question to be settled not by us, but by our contemporaries and posterity.

“It is matter of history, with regard to the past, and will not be questioned, that now, as formerly, the South is upon the basis of the Discipline, on the subject of slavery. The minority believe it equally certain that this is not true with regard to the North proper especially. In view, then, of the unity of the Methodist Episcopal Church, which party has been, in equity, entitled to the sympathy and protection of the middle or *umpire* Conferences? those who through good and evil report have kept good faith and adhered to law, or those whose opinions and purposes have led them to seek a state of things in advance of law, and thus dishonor its forms and sanctions?

“7th. In proportion as the minority appreciate and cling to the unity of the Methodist Episcopal Church, they are bound, further, to except to the position of the majority, in this controversy. Allow that Bishop Andrew, without, however, any infringement of law, is, on account of his connection with slavery, unacceptable in the Northern Conferences. It is equally known to the majority, that any Bishop of the Church, either violating, or submitting to a violation of the compromise charter of union between the North and the South, without proper and public remonstrance, cannot be acceptable at the South, and need not appear there. By pressing the issue in question, therefore, the majority virtually dissolve the government of the Methodist Episcopal Church, because in every constitutional aspect it is sundered by so crippling a co-ordinate branch of it as to destroy the itinerant general superintendency altogether. Whenever it is clearly ascertained that the compromise law of the Church, regulating slavery and abolition, is abandoned, every Bishop, each of the venerable and excellent men who now adorn the Church and its counsels, *ceases* to be a general superintendent. The law of union, the principle of gravitation, binding us together, is dissolved, and the general superintendency of the Methodist Episcopal Church is no more!

“8th. The South have not been led thus to protest merely because of the treatment received by Bishop Andrew, or the kindred action of this body in other matters. The abandonment of the compromise—the official refusal by the majority, as we have understood them, to abide the arbitrament of law, is their principal ground of complaint and remonstrance. If the minority have not entirely misunderstood the majority, the abolition and anti-slavery principles of the North will no longer allow them to submit to the law of the Discipline on the general

subject of slavery and abolition; and if this be so, if the compromise law be either repealed or allowed to remain a dead letter, *the South cannot submit, and the absolute necessity of division is already dated.* And should the exigent circumstances in which the minority find themselves placed, by the facts and developments alluded to in this remonstrance, render it finally necessary that the Southern Conferences should have a *separate, independent* existence, it is hoped that the character and services of the minority, together with the numbers and claims of the ministry and membership of the portion of the Church represented by them, not less than similar reasons and considerations on the part of the Northern and middle Conferences, will suggest the high moral fitness of meeting this great emergency with strong and steady purpose to do justice to all concerned. And it is believed that, approaching the subject in this way, it will be found practicable to devise and adopt such measures and arrangements, present and prospective, as will secure an amicable division of the Church upon the broad principles of right and equity, and destined to result in the common good of the great body of ministers and members found on either side *the line of separation.*

Signed by the following delegates, viz:—

“*Kentucky.*—H. B. Bascom, William Gunn, H. H. Kavanaugh, Edward Stevenson, B. T. Crouch, G. W. Brush.

“*Virginia Conference.*—John Early, W. A. Smith, Thomas Crowder, Leroy M. Lee.

“*Missouri.*—W. W. Redman, William Patton, J. C. Berryman, J. M. Jameson.

“*Holston.*—E. F. Sevier, S. Patton, Thomas Stringfield.

“*Georgia.*—G. F. Pierce, William J. Parks, L. Pierce, J. W. Glenn, J. E. Evans, A. B. Longstreet.

“*North Carolina.*—James Jamieson, Peter Doub, B. T. Blake.

“*Illinois.*—N. C. Berryman, J. Stamper.

“*Memphis.*—G. W. D. Harris, Wm. McMahan, Thomas Joyner, S. S. Moody.

“*Arkansas.*—J. C. Parker, Wm. P. Ratcliffe, A. Hunter.

“*Mississippi.*—W. Winans, B. M. Drake, J. Lane, G. M. Rogers.

“*Texas.*—Littleton Fowler.

“*Alabama.*—J. Boring, J. Hamilton, W. Murrah, G. Garrett.

“*Tennessee.*—Robert Paine, John B. McFerrin, A. L. P. Green, T. Maddin.

“*South Carolina.*—William Capers, William M. Wightman, Charles Betts, S. Dunwoody, H. A. C. Walker.

“*Philadelphia.*—I. T. Cooper, W. Cooper, T. I. Thompson, Henry White.

“*Ohio.*—E. W. Schon.

New Jersey.—T. Neal, T. Sovereign.”

The chair ordered the Protest to be entered upon the Conference journal.

On motion of Dr. Simpson, Dr. Olin, Dr. Durbin, and Mr. Hamline were appointed a committee "to prepare a statement of facts connected with the proceedings in the case of Bishop Andrew," and that they have liberty to examine the Protest," &c. In other words, the committee was raised to prepare a *reply* to the Protest, and this purpose is distinctly avowed; but as a *reply* to a *protest* was a thing without precedent, it was so modified as to propose a "statement of facts."

The action of the Conference had involved the Bishops in a perplexing difficulty. The Conference had declared it the *sense* of the body that Bishop Andrew should cease to exercise the functions of his office; but the resolution was so conveniently ambiguous, that while on the one hand Mr. Hamline had pronounced it "a *mandamus* measure, whose passage would *absolutely suspend the exercise of the superintendent's functions, until he complied with the prescribed condition*—the power to do which was the same with that required to *suspend or depose* a Bishop,"—on the other hand, Dr. Durbin said that the resolution "only proposed to express the sense of this Conference in regard to a matter which it cannot, in duty and conscience, pass by without a suitable expression; and having made the solemn expression, it leaves Bishop Andrew to act as *his* sense of duty shall dictate." He even said, that if any man should charge him, in voting for the resolution, (the *mandamus* measure of *absolute* suspension of Mr. Hamline,) with voting to *depose* Bishop Andrew, he would consider it a personal insult. Now, it became the duty of the Bishops to make out and publish their plan of episcopal visitation for the succeeding four years, at the close of the General Conference; and if the construction of the Hamline section was correct, Bishop Andrew was "absolutely suspended," and of course could not be taken into the plan of episcopal labor; but if the Durbin section of the party was right, then the General Conference having expressed its *sense* of the matter, left Bishop Andrew perfectly free to be governed by *his* sense of duty, and of course there was nothing to prevent his being rendered available in the episcopacy. In this state of conflicting opinions among the Northern leaders, the Bishops found it necessary to apply again to the oracle for a less equivocal response; for act as they might, they must come into conflict with one or other division of the majority. They therefore addressed to the General Conference the following inquiries:—

"To the General Conference.

"Reverend and Dear Brethren,—

"As the case of Bishop Andrew unavoidably involves the

future *action* of the superintendents, which, in their judgment, in the present position of the Bishop, they have no discretion to decide upon, they respectfully request of the General Conference *official* instruction, in answer to the following questions:—

“*First.* Shall Bishop Andrew’s name remain as it now stands in the Minutes, Hymn-book, and Discipline, or shall it be struck off these official records?”

“*Second.* How shall the Bishop obtain his support?—as provided for in the form of Discipline, or in some other way?”

“*Third.* What work, if any, may the Bishop perform; and how shall he be appointed to the work?”

“JOSHUA SOULE,
“ELIJAH HEDDING,
“BEVERLY WAUGH,
“THOS. A. MORRIS.”

To these inquiries the Conference returned the following answer:—

“*Resolved, 1st,* as the sense of this Conference, That Bishop Andrew’s name stand in the Minutes, Hymn-book, and Discipline, as formerly.

“*Resolved, 2d,* That the rule in reference to the support of a Bishop and his family, applies to Bishop Andrew.

“*Resolved, 3d,* That whether in any, and in what work, Bishop Andrew be employed, is to be determined by his own decision and action, in relation to the previous action of this Conference in his case.”

The first of these resolutions was adopted by a vote of 155 to 17, none voting against it but ultra northerners or abolitionists.

The second resolution was adopted by a vote of 152 to 14.

On the third, the grand mystifying resolution, which placed the matter just where it was before, the vote stood as follows:

YEAS. Nathan Bangs, Phineas Rice, George Peck, John B. Stratten, Peter P. Sandford, Fitch Reed, Samuel D. Ferguson, Stephen Martindale, Marvin Richardson, J. Lovejoy, F. Upham, S. Benton, Paul Townsend, J. Porter, D. S. King, P. Crandall, C. Adams, G. Pickering, M. Hill, E. Robinson, D. B. Randall, C. W. Morse, J. Hobart, Heman Nickerson, G. Webber, Elihu Scott, S. Chamberlain, Samuel Kelley, J. Perkins, J. Spaulding, C. D. Cahoon, William D. Cass, Truman Seymour, James Covell, Tobias Spicer, Seymour Coleman, James B. Houghtaling, Jesse T. Peck, A. D. Peck, A. Adams, G. Baker, W. W. Ninde, J. M. Snyder, S. Comfort, N. Rounds, D. A. Shepherd, H. F. Row, E. Bowen, D. Holmes, G. Filmore, S. Luckey, A. Steele, F. G. Hibbard, A. Abell, W. Hosmer, J. B. Alverson, J. S. Steadman, John Bain, G. W. Clarke, J. Robinson, T. Goodwin, William

Hunter, H. J. Clark, J. Spencer, S. Elliott, S. Wakefield, J. Drummond, C. Elliott, William H. Raper, J. M. Trimble, J. B. Finley, L. L. Hamline, Z. Connell, J. H. Power, A. Poe, E. Yocum, W. Runnells, E. Crane, A. Billings, J. A. Baughman, M. Simpson, A. Wiley, E. R. Ames, J. Miller, C. W. Ruter, A. Wood, A. Eddy, J. Havens, B. Weed, H. W. Reed, J. T. Mitchell, P. Akers, P. Cartwright, A. Griffith, J. Bear, N. J. B. Morgan, J. A. Collins, J. Davis, J. P. Durbin, L. Scott, I. Winner, J. S. Porter, J. K. Shaw—103.

NAYS. C. W. Carpenter, John G. Dow, R. Boyd, G. Smith, J. Stamper, J. Van Cleve, N. G. Berryman, W. W. Redman, J. C. Berryman, J. M. Jameson, H. B. Bascom, W. Gunn, H. H. Kavanaugh, E. Stevenson, B. T. Crouch, G. W. Brush, E. F. Sevier, S. Patton, T. Stringfield, R. Paine, J. B. McFerrin, A. L. P. Green, T. Maddin, G. W. D. Harris, S. S. Moody, William McMahon, T. Joyner, J. C. Parker, W. P. Ratcliffe, A. Hunter, L. Fowler, William Winans, B. M. Drake, J. Lane, G. M. Rogers, William Murrah, J. Boring, G. Garrett, J. Hamilton, G. F. Pierce, L. Pierce, W. J. Pafks, J. W. Glenn, J. E. Evans, A. B. Longstreet, William Capers, W. M. Wightman, C. Betts, S. Dunwoody, H. A. C. Walker, Peter Doub, B. T. Blake, J. Early, L. M. Lee, W. A. Smith, T. Crowder, H. Slicer, C. B. Tippet, T. B. Sargent, J. A. Gere, G. Hildt, T. J. Thompson, H. White, I. T. Cooper, W. Cooper, T. Neal, T. Sovereign—67.

This resolution allowed one party of the North still to regard the action of the General Conference as *mandatory*, and the other to consider it merely *advisory*. And up to the present time not the smallest advance has been made toward any settled or agreed understanding on the part of the majority, as to the true nature and intention of the action against Bishop Andrew.

June 7th. Dr. Paine, chairman of the select committee of nine, reported the following Plan of Separation:—

“The select committee of nine to consider and report on the declaration of the delegates from the Conferences of the slaveholding states, beg leave to submit the following report:

“Whereas, a declaration has been presented to this General Conference, with the signatures of *fifty-one* delegates of the body from thirteen Annual Conferences in the slaveholding States, representing that, for various reasons enumerated, the objects and purposes of the Christian ministry and Church organization cannot be successfully accomplished by them under the jurisdiction of this General Conference as now constituted; and

“Whereas, in the event of a separation, a contingency to which the declaration asks attention as not improbable, we esteem it the duty of this General Conference to meet the

emergency with Christian kindness and the strictest equity; therefore,

“*Resolved*, by the delegates of the several Annual Conferences in General Conference assembled,

“1. That, should the Annual Conferences in the slaveholding States find it necessary to unite in a distinct ecclesiastical connection, the following rule shall be observed with regard to the Northern boundary of such connection:—All the societies, stations, and Conferences adhering to the Church in the South, by a vote of a majority of the members of said societies, stations, and Conferences, shall remain under the unmolested pastoral care of the Southern Church; and the ministers of the Methodist Episcopal Church shall in no wise attempt to organize Churches or societies within the limits of the Church South, nor shall they attempt to exercise any pastoral oversight therein; it being understood that the ministry of the South reciprocally observe the same rule in relation to stations, societies, and Conferences, adhering, by vote of a majority, to the Methodist Episcopal Church; provided also, that this rule shall apply only to societies, stations, and Conferences bordering on the line of division, and not to interior charges, which shall in all cases be left to the care of that Church within whose territory they are situated.

“2. That ministers, local and traveling, of every grade and office in the Methodist Episcopal Church, may, as they prefer, remain in that Church, or, without blame, attach themselves to the Church South.

“3. *Resolved*, by the delegates of all the Annual Conferences in General Conference assembled, That we recommend to all the Annual Conferences, at their first approaching sessions, to authorize a change of the sixth restrictive article, so that the first clause shall read thus: ‘They shall not appropriate the produce of the Book Concern, nor of the Chartered Fund, to any other purpose other than for the benefit of the traveling, supernumerary, superannuated, and worn-out preachers, their wives, widows, and children, and to such other purposes as may be determined upon by the vote of two-thirds of the members of the General Conference.’

“4. That whenever the Annual Conferences, by a vote of three-fourths of all their members voting on the third resolution, shall have concurred in the recommendation to alter the sixth restrictive article, the Agents at New York and Cincinnati shall, and they are hereby authorized and directed to deliver over to any authorized agent or appointee of the Church South, should one be organized, all notes and book accounts against the ministers, church members, or citizens, within its boundaries, with authority to collect the same for the sole use of the

Southern Church, and that said Agents also convey to aforesaid agent or appointee of the South, all the real estate, and assign to him all the property, including presses, stock, and all right and interest connected with the printing establishments at Charleston, Richmond, and Nashville, which now belong to the Methodist Episcopal Church.

“5. That when the Annual Conferences shall have approved the aforesaid change in the sixth restrictive article, there shall be transferred to the above agent for the Southern Church so much of the capital and produce of the Methodist Book Concern as will, with the notes, book accounts, presses, &c., mentioned in the last resolution, bear the same proportion to the whole property of said Concern that the traveling preachers in the Southern Church shall bear to all the traveling ministers of the Methodist Episcopal Church; the division to be made on the basis of the number of traveling preachers in the forthcoming Minutes.

“6. That the above transfer shall be in the form of annual payments of \$25,000 per annum, and specifically in stock of the Book Concern, and in Southern notes and accounts due the establishment, and accruing after the first transfer mentioned above; and until the payments are made, the Southern Church shall share in all the nett profits of the Book Concern, in the proportion that the amount due them, or in arrears, bears to all the property of the Concern.

“7. That Nathan Bangs, George Peck, and James B. Finley be, and they are hereby appointed commissioners to act in concert with the same number of commissioners appointed by the Southern organization, (should one be formed,) to estimate the amount which will fall due to the South by the preceding rule, and to have full powers to carry into effect the whole arrangements proposed with regard to the division of property, should the separation take place. And if by any means a vacancy occurs in this board of commissioners, the Book Committee at New York shall fill said vacancy.

“8. That whenever any agents of the Southern Church are clothed with legal authority or corporate power to act in the premises, the Agents at New York are hereby authorized and directed to act in concert with said Southern agents, so as to give the provisions of these resolutions a legally binding force.

“9. That all the property of the Methodist Episcopal Church in meeting houses, parsonages, colleges, schools, Conference funds, cemeteries, and of every kind within the limits of the Southern organization, shall be forever free from any claim set up on the part of the Methodist Episcopal Church, so far as this resolution can be of force in the premises.

“10. That the Church so formed in the South shall have a

common right to use all the copy-rights in possession of the Book Concerns at New York and Cincinnati, at the time of the settlement by the commissioners.

"11. That the Book Agents at New York be directed to make such compensation to the Conferences South, for their dividend from the Chartered Fund, as the commissioners above provided for shall agree upon.

"12. That the Bishops be respectfully requested to lay that part of this report requiring the action of the Annual Conferences before them as soon as possible, beginning with the New York Conference."

June 8th. The Plan was taken up, and

"Dr. Elliot moved its adoption, and would explain his views on the subject without attempting to approach debate. He had had the opportunity of examining it, and had done so narrowly. He believed it would insure the purposes designed, and would be for the best interests of the Church. It was his firm opinion that this was a proper course for them to pursue, in conformity with the Scriptures, and the best analogies they could collect from the ancient Churches, as well as from the best organized modern Churches. All history did not furnish an example of so large a body of Christians remaining in such close and unbroken connection as the Methodist Episcopal Church. It was now found necessary to separate this large body, for it was becoming unwieldy. He referred to the Churches at Antioch, Alexandria, and Jerusalem, which, though they continued as one, were at least as distinct as the Methodist Episcopal Church would be if the suggested separation took place. The Church of England was one under the Bishops of Canterbury and York, connected and yet distinct. In his own mind it had been for years perfectly clear that to this conclusion they must eventually come. Were the question that now unhappily agitated the body dead and buried, there would be good reason for passing the resolutions contained in that report. As to their representation in that General Conference, one out of twenty was but a meagre representation, and to go on as they had done, it would soon be one out of thirty. And the body was now too large to do business advantageously. The measure contemplated was not schism, but separation for their mutual convenience and prosperity."

Mr. Griffith opposed the measure, and denied the power of the General Conference to divide the Church.

Mr. Cartwright thought the measure a wicked one, and that it robbed both North and South of their rights. "From the days of O'Kelly down to the last Scottite disturbances, God had provided a *trash-trap* to take away the *scum*." He was willing to lay the whole matter before the people for four years, and then

abide the result. Dr. Paine advocated the measure. Dr. Lucky said,—

“He regarded the resolution as provisional and preliminary, settling nothing at present, but providing, in an amicable and proper way, for such action as it might hereafter be necessary to take. He hoped such necessity would never arise, and that Southern brethren would not find it necessary to leave them. Reference had been made to secession, &c. But was it not better that they should separate than have a continuation of strife and of warfare? The danger apprehended by his friend from Illinois existed only in the fires of his imagination. He (Dr. L.) had said privately and frequently, that if the separation were necessary, it ought to be amicably and constitutionally effected, and there was no intention of doing it otherwise. Allusion had been made to the radicalism that had disturbed the Church some years ago, but that had no affinity with the present case. He granted that Mr. Wesley had contended at one time for the unity of the Methodist body throughout the world, but he subsequently saw it necessary to permit the connection in the United States to separate, and had it not been for the best?”

“Dr. Bangs explained the composition of the committee, as formed by three from the South, three from the middle States, and three from the North. They were also instructed, by a resolution of the Conference, how to act in the premises; that if they could not adjust the difficulties amicably, they were to provide for separation if they could do so constitutionally.—Under such instructions the committee went out and proceeded to interchange their thoughts upon the subject. Great difficulties arose, which were revolved in their minds, and after two days of close labor, after minute inspection and revision of every sentence, they had presented this report, from which the Conference would see that they had at least obeyed their instructions, and had met the constitutional difficulty by sending round to the Annual Conferences that portion of the report which required their concurrence. The speakers who have opposed that report have taken entirely erroneous views of it. It did not speak of division—the word had been carefully avoided through the whole document—it only said, “in the event of a separation taking place,” throwing the responsibility from off the shoulders of the General Conference and upon those who should say that such a separation was necessary. He hoped the time would never come. But what was the true course for men brought into difficulties? Why, there was an old adage—and he knew not that it was any the worse for its age—of two evils choose the least—the choice was between the violent separation of the South and its peaceable

and amicable separation; and which was the lesser evil? He need not answer, for the response was already in every man's breast. Objections had been made on the ground of the resolutions interfering with liberty of conscience on the part of the members, by forcing them to take a position which they might not wish to take. That was a groundless objection altogether. The laws, discipline, doctrines, government, all would be the same, and they should be as warm in their affection toward each other as they are now. [Amen, in a very earnest and feeling tone from Dr. Capers.] Allusion had been made to the course pursued by Mr. Wesley, in reference to the Methodist Church in the United States. The same would apply to the Methodist societies in Ireland. They had an independent Conference."

Several voices. No, no.

Mr. T. B. Sargent. "They have a separate relation just as the government of Ireland differs from the government of England,—it is indeed adapted to the civic government."

Dr. Bangs. "That is just what we want. The South ask a separate Conference, adapted to the institutions of that portion of the country. Another evil was that there was a diversity of sentiment among the border Conferences; if the line proposed by the resolutions were drawn it would lessen the evil and perhaps remove it out of the way altogether. He (Dr. B.) had been a traveling preacher about forty-four years, and gloried in the belief that the Methodist Episcopal Church was one; he had done all in his power to keep it so. He hoped that the providence of God would overrule the present adverse circumstances for good, but if they must separate, was it right to deprive their brethren of the South of their just rights? Would it be right for the majority to deprive the minority of one iota of their rights, temporal or spiritual? He would not do it, and he hoped the Conference would come to a unanimous adoption of the report."

"Mr. Filmore explained still further the constitution and labors of the committee, and went on to say that the design of God in raising up the Methodists was to spread Scriptural holiness through the land. The brethren from the South say, they fear they cannot go on doing this under existing circumstances. The North say, if they yield any of the ground they have taken, they shall throw impediments in their own path in carrying out the same object. Now Methodism, as the child of Providence, adjusts herself, as she has always done, to the circumstances of the case—she proposes that, if these fears prove well grounded, they divide into bands, and go on spreading holiness through their respective territories; their strife, he believed, would be to excel in straight-forward Wesleyan Meth-

odism. The resolutions do not say that the South must go, shall go, will go, or that any body wants them to go; but simply make provision for such a contingency, and provide that in such case they shall have all necessary munitions of war for carrying on their holy enterprise. He did not think there was a man among them who would dare to lay his head upon his pillow, if he held from his Southern brethren one cent of their common funds.

"The report had cost the committee three days of close application, and the sub-committee had worked by night as well as by day. Every sentiment in the report had been sifted, and every word weighed, and the committee had brought it in understanding what it was. He was aware it was the work of human hands; but let that General Conference propose fifty amendments, and fifty to one they would amend it for the worse."

"Mr. Finley could see in the report no proposition to divide the Church. If he saw such a proposal he should stop at the threshold. Nor did he see anything unconstitutional in it. The constitution did not require them to send abroad a proposition to divide the Church, and it would, therefore, be unconstitutional to send such a proposition to the Annual Conferences. And now he expected his brother from Illinois, (Cartwright) and himself, would tear the blanket between them, they having got hold on opposite sides.

"The parties voting on each side of the great question stood precisely alike. There was a great gulf between them, and he wished there was middle ground on which both could stand. His heart would have gladly moved further if he could have secured what he wanted; but he and his friends had gone as far as the safety of the work would allow them. There was one point that had not been touched yet. Mr. Wesley separated the American Church from the English Church. And in 1824-8 there was an application made by the Canada Conference, to set them off as a distinct Church; and the General Conference told them they had no power to do so, but gave them liberty to do just what they now proposed to do with the South. They agreed, that if they went off, and set up for themselves, we would authorize one of our Bishops to ordain a man for them, if they should elect one to the episcopacy."

Mr. Cartwright. "We did not give them any part of the funds."

Dr. Bangs. "The New York Conference gave them \$10,000."

Mr. Finley. "The General Conference voted that the New York Conference should make that division, and we are now doing nothing more than we did then."

A call being made for the reading of the Journal on this point, "Mr. Hamline took the floor, by consent, until the journals were examined. He explained the action of the committee in reference to the sixth restrictive article. When the first committee met they had before them a paper, which proposed a new form or division of the Church. The committee thought there were difficulties in the way of such a proposition. One provision was to send it to the Annual Conferences, but that was unconstitutional and revolutionary in its character; and when their votes came back the General Conference would have no more authority than they had now. Why then send it? The Book Concern is chartered in behalf of the General Methodist Episcopal Church of the United States; and if they did separate until only one State remained, still Methodism would remain the same, and it would still be the Methodist Episcopal Church of the United States. But if they sent out to the Annual Conferences to alter one restrictive article it would be constitutional, and to divide the Book Concern so that they might be honest men and ministers. The resolution goes on to make provision, if the Annual Conferences concur, for the security and efficiency of the Southern Conferences, for the Methodist Church would embrace them in its fraternal arms, tendering to them fraternal feelings and the temporalities to which they were entitled. And the committee thought it could not be objected to on the ground of constitutionality. He, for one, would wish to have his name recorded affirming them to be brethren, if they found they must separate. God forbid that they should go as an arm torn out of the body, leaving the point of juncture all gory and ghastly! But let them go as brethren 'beloved in the Lord,' and let us hear their voice responsive claiming us for brethren—let us go and preach Jesus to them, and they come and preach Jesus to us."

Dr. Bond earnestly contended against giving border societies, stations, &c., the right of choosing to which side they would belong, and insisted on following *conference lines*, requiring all on the North side to adhere to the North, and all on the South side to adhere to the South. "I do beseech brethren," said the Doctor, "to weigh well this matter, and that you adhere to the conference lines, as they now stand, *and then we shall have peace.*"

Mr. Collins said, he belonged to a part slaveholding and part non-slaveholding country. He, in connection with others, sought some common ground, on which they could all meet and unite in kind and fraternal feelings. They were not able it seemed to come to that ground. He had mentioned at the time of the vote on Bishop Andrew's case, that he should move a re-consideration; and he had done so with intention, that if any measure could be proposed which would render that action

unnecessary, they might recall it. He had seen no such measure yet, and therefore had not moved a re-consideration. He thought the report contained the best proposition under the circumstances, and they were not prepared to throw out any thing which would tend to heal the breach. He hoped they would not come to separation at all. The Southern brethren had taken such ground before them, and they were well known to be men of integrity, as well as talents and piety, and had taken a strong hold upon their people, so that if the evil could be averted he believed it would be. But, if it must come, let there be a *pro rata* division of the concern. The preachers would have to let the members decide the question for themselves.

Mr. Porter advocated the resolutions briefly.

Mr. Sandford opposed the Plan as tending to encourage separation.

Some remarks were made and amendments suggested, which seemed to assume that the Annual Conferences must first vote to change the sixth restrictive rule, before the other parts of the Plan of Separation could go into effect. To correct this impression, Dr. Winans gave the history of the matter in committee. He said, "It would be observed that there was only one provision of the whole report that went to the Annual Conferences; and that merely authorized, should occasion occur, the appropriation of the proceeds of the Book Concern otherwise than was now appropriated. They were not sending round to the Annual Conferences any proposition in which the action of the South in reference to the separation was concerned. The only proposition was that they might have liberty, if necessary, to organize a separate Conference; and it was important that the South should know, at an early period, that they had such liberty, in order to allay the intense excitement which prevailed in that portion of the work."

"Mr. Hamline would state the views of the committee on the subject. They had carefully avoided presenting any resolution which would embrace the idea of separation or division. The article which was referred to the Annual Conferences had not necessarily any connection with division. It was thought, as complaints were abroad respecting the present mode of appropriating the proceeds of the Book Concern, it would be for the general good that the power to appropriate such proceeds should be put in the power of a two-thirds vote, instead of in the power of a mere majority, thus making it more difficult to make a wrong appropriation. And the occasion of this report was taken hold of by the committee to make it more difficult to misappropriate the funds, in which they believed they should serve both the particular object of the report and the general good of the Methodist E. Church."

Mr. Filmore said, "the design of the committee was to put a restriction upon the General Conference, and to make a two-thirds vote necessary to all appropriations of the produce of the Book Concern, instead of a majority."

The remarks of these members of the committee, with the action of the Conference in refusing any amendment or modification to suit an opposite view of the subject, show most conclusively that the design was not to make any other part of the Plan of separation dependent upon a change of the restrictive rule.

The *first* resolution in the Plan was then adopted by a vote of 147 to 22; and after a re-consideration of the vote, for the purpose of authorizing the *Southern Conferences* instead of the *Delegates* to decide on the necessity of a separation, the vote was again taken, and stood ayes 135, noes 15, as follows:—

YEAS.—N. Bangs, P. Rice, G. Peck, S. D. Ferguson, M. Richardson, F. Upham, P. Townsend, J. J. Porter, D. S. King, P. Crandall, C. Adams, G. Pickering, M. Hill, E. Robinson, D. B. Randall, C. W. Morse, G. Webber, E. Scott, S. Kelly, J. Perkins, J. G. Dow, J. Spaulding, C. D. Cahoon, W. D. Cass, T. Seymour, J. M. Wever, J. Covell, T. Spicer, S. Coleman, J. B. Houghtaling, J. T. Peck, A. Adams, G. Baker, W. W. Ninde, N. Rounds, D. A. Shepherd, E. Bowen, G. Filmore, S. Lucky, F. G. Hibbard, S. Seager, A. Abell, W. Hosmer, J. B. Alverson, J. J. Steadman, G. W. Clark, J. Robinson, W. Hunter, H. J. Clark, J. Spencer, S. Elliott, R. Boyd, J. Drummond, C. Elliott, W. H. Raper, E. W. Schon, J. M. Trimble, J. B. Finley, Z. Connell, E. Thompson, E. Yocum, W. Runnells, G. Smith, A. Billings, J. Baughman, M. Simpson, A. Wiley, E. R. Ames, C. W. Ruter, A. Wood, A. Eddy, B. Weed, J. Sinclair, H. W. Reed, J. T. Mitchell, P. Akers, J. Stamper, J. Vancleve, N. G. Berryman, W. W. Redman, J. C. Berryman, J. M. Jamieson, H. B. Bascom, W. Gunn, H. H. Kavanaugh, E. Stevenson, B. T. Crouch, G. W. Brush, E. F. Sevier, S. Patton, T. Stringfield, R. Paine, J. B. McFerrin, A. L. P. Green, T. Maddin, G. W. D. Harris, S. S. Moody, W. McMahon, T. Joyner, J. C. Parker, W. P. Ratcliffe, A. Hunter, L. Fowler, J. Clarke, W. Winans, B. M. Drake, J. Lane, G. M. Rogers, W. Murrah, J. Boring, G. Garrett, J. Hamilton, L. Pierce, G. F. Pierce, W. J. Parks, J. W. Glenn, J. E. Evans, A. B. Longstreet, W. Capers, W. M. Wightman, C. Betts, S. Dunwoody, H. A. C. Walker, J. Jamieson, P. Doub, B. T. Blake, J. Early, L. M. Lee, W. A. Smith, T. Crowder, H. Slicer, N. J. B. Morgan, C. B. Tippet, T. B. Sargent, J. A. Collins, J. Davis, J. A. Gere, G. Hildt, J. P. Durbin, T. J. Thompson, H. White, I. T. Cooper, L. Scott, W. Cooper, J. S. Porter, T. Neal, T. Sovereign—135.

NAYS.—P. P. Sandford, S. Martindale, J. Lovejoy, S. Benton, J. Hobart, H. Nickerson, A. D. Peck, J. M. Snyder, H. F. Row, D. Holmes, J. H. Power, A. Poe, P. Cartwright, A. Griffith, J. Bear—15.

The *second* resolution was adopted by one hundred and thirty-nine affirmative to seventeen negative votes.

The *third* resolution was adopted by the following vote:—

YEAS.—N. Bangs, P. Rice, G. Peck, S. D. Ferguson, M. Richardson, F. Upham, P. Townsend, J. Porter, D. S. King, P. Crandall, C. Adams, G. Pickering, M. Hill, E. Robinson, D. B. Randall, C. W. Morse, G. Webber, E. Scott, S. Kelly, J. Perkins, J. G. Dow, C. D. Cahoon, W. D. Cass, T. Seymour, J. M. Wever, J. Covel, T. Spicer, S. Coleman, J. B. Houghtaling, J. T. Peck, A. Adams, G. Baker, W. W. Ninde, N. Rounds, D. A. Shepherd, E. Bowen, G. Filmore, S. Luckey, F. G. Hibbard, S. Seagre, A. Abell, W. Hosmer, J. B. Alverson, J. J. Steadman, G. W. Clarke, J. Robinson, W. Hunter, H. J. Clark, J. Spencer, S. Elliott, R. Boyd, J. Drummond, C. Elliott, W. H. Raper, E. W. Schon, J. M. Trimble, J. B. Finley, Z. Connell, E. Thompson, E. Yocum, W. Runnells, G. Smith, A. Billings, J. A. Baughman, M. Simpson, A. Wiley, E. R. Ames, C. W. Ruter, A. Wood, A. Eddy, B. Weed, J. Sinclair, H. W. Reed, J. T. Mitchell, P. Akers, J. Stamper, J. Vancleve, N. G. Berryman, W. W. Redman, J. C. Berryman, J. M. Jameson, H. B. Bascom, W. Gunn, H. H. Kavanaugh, E. Stevenson, B. T. Crouch, G. W. Brush, E. F. Sevier, S. Patton, T. Stringfield, R. Paine, J. B. McFerrin, A. L. P. Green, T. Maddin, G. W. D. Harris, S. S. Moody, W. McMahon, T. Joyner, J. C. Parker, W. P. Ratcliffe, A. Hunter, L. Fowler, J. Clark, W. Winans, B. M. Drake, J. Lane, G. M. Rogers, W. Murrah, J. Boring, G. Garrett, J. Hamilton, L. Pierce, G. F. Pierce, W. J. Parks, J. W. Glenn, J. E. Evans, A. B. Longstreet, W. Capers, W. M. Wightman, C. Betts, S. Dunwoody, H. A. C. Walker, J. Jamieson, P. Doub, B. T. Blake, J. Early, L. M. Lee, W. A. Smith, T. Crowder, H. Slicer, N. J. B. Morgan, C. B. Tippet, T. B. Sargent, J. A. Collins, J. Davis, J. A. Gere, G. Hildt, J. P. Durbin, T. J. Thompson, H. White, I. T. Cooper, L. Scott, W. Cooper, J. S. Porter, T. Neal, T. Sovereign—147.

NAYS.—P. P. Sandford, J. Lovejoy, J. M. Snyder, S. Comfort, H. F. Row, D. Holmes, J. Bain, J. H. Power, P. Cartwright, A. Griffith—10.

The *fifth* resolution was adopted—ayes 153, noes 13. The following is the vote:—

YEAS.—N. Bangs, P. Rice, J. B. Stratten, F. Reed, S. D. Ferguson, S. Martindale, F. Upham, P. Townsend, J. Porter, D. S. King, P. Crandall, C. Adams, G. Pickering, M. Hill, E. Robinson, D. B. Randall, C. W. Morse, J. Hobart, H. Nickerson, G.

Webber, E. Scott, S. Kelly, J. Perkins, J. G. Dow, J. Spaulding, C. D. Cahoon, W. D. Cass, T. Seymour, J. M. Wever, J. Covel, T. Spicer, J. B. Houghtaling, J. T. Peck, A. Adams, G. Baker, W. W. Ninde, N. Rounds, D. A. Shepherd, E. Bowen, G. Filmore, S. Lucky, A. Steele, F. G. Hibbard, S. Seager, A. Abell, W. Hosmer, J. B. Alverson, J. J. Steadman, G. W. Clark, J. Robinson, T. Goodwin, W. Hunter, H. J. Clark, J. Spencer, S. Elliot, R. Boyd, S. Wakefield, J. Drummond, C. Elliott, W. H. Raper, E. W. Schon, J. M. Trimble, J. B. Finley, Z. Connell, E. Thompson, A. Poe, E. Yocum, W. Runnells, A. Billings, J. A. Baughman, M. Simpson, A. Wiley, E. R. Ames, C. W. Ruter, A. Wood, A. Eddy, B. Weed, J. Sinclair, H. W. Reed, J. T. Mitchell, P. Akers, J. Stamper, J. Vancleve, N. G. Berryman, W. W. Redman, J. C. Berryman, J. M. Jameson, H. B. Bascom, W. Gunn, H. H. Kavanaugh, E. Stevenson, B. T. Crouch, G. W. Brush, E. F. Sevier, S. Patton, T. Stringfield, R. Paine, J. B. M'Ferrin, A. L. P. Green, T. Maddin, G. W. D. Harris, S. S. Moody, W. M'Mahon, T. Joyner, J. C. Parker, W. P. Ratcliffe, A. Hunter, L. Fowler, J. Clark, W. Winans, B. M. Drake, J. Lane, G. M. Rogers, W. Murrah, J. Boring, G. Garrett, J. Hamilton, L. Pierce, G. F. Pierce, W. J. Parks, J. W. Glenn, J. E. Evans, A. B. Longstreet, W. Capers, W. M. Wightman, C. Betts, S. Dunwoody, H. A. C. Walker, J. Jamieson, P. Doub, J. Early, L. M. Lee, W. A. Smith, T. Crowder, H. Slicer, N. J. B. Morgan, C. B. Tippet, T. B. Sargent, J. A. Collins, J. Davis, J. A. Gere, G. Hildt, J. P. Durbin, T. J. Thompson, H. White, I. T. Cooper, L. Scott, W. Cooper, J. S. Porter, T. Neal, T. Sovereign—153.

NAYS.—P. P. Sandford, J. Lovejoy, S. Benton, H. Nickerson, S. Comfort, H. F. Row, D. Holmes, J. H. Power, P. Cartwright, A. Griffith, J. Bear, J. M. Snyder, J. Bain—13.

The other resolutions, preamble, &c., were adopted without a division.

Considering the novelty and great importance of the measure, the great unanimity with which it was adopted was very remarkable; and at the same time highly creditable to the justice, liberality, and Christian spirit of the parties concerned. Throughout this protracted and most exciting discussion, but little bitterness of spirit or unkindness of language was indulged. A forbearing, dignified, and courteous manner characterized nearly all the speakers engaged in the debate.

On the 10th of June—the last day of the session—Dr. Durbin introduced and read the Reply to the Protest of the minority. This document it is not deemed necessary to insert at length in this history, as it occupied generally the same ground with the leading speakers of the majority, and especially the speech of Bishop Hamline, which seems to have been taken

as the basis of the Reply, as well as—more recently—of Dr. Peck's book in reply to Dr. Bascom. The Reply sets out with a professed intention to give a statement of the *law* and of the *facts* in the case, but is almost wholly argumentative. Its leading topics will be very briefly noted:—It is said the proceeding against Bishop Andrew was not *judicial* nor *punitive*—that it neither *deposed* nor *suspended* him. Yet it contained a direct intimation that if he violated the *injunction* laid on him, that he would have it to account for at the next General Conference. [This, however, was stricken out before it went to record.] Much stress is laid on the fact, that the Church had never elected a slaveholding Bishop, as an argument not only justifying, but requiring the action in the case of Bishop Andrew. But the fact that the first Methodist Bishop was for a time a slaveholder without censure, though he became such by purchase, is not adverted to in the Reply, though certainly as strong a case as that of Bishop Andrew.

It is said that should the law of Georgia on the subject of emancipation become relaxed or repealed, the rule of the Discipline on slavery applicable to traveling preachers, would then “become *imperative* on Bishop Andrew.” And yet the Reply contains an elaborate argument intended to prove that this same law can have no application to a Bishop in any case, whether considered in its letter or its reason. And in proof of this, that the framers of the law “did not dream” that a Bishop would ever become a slaveholder, (though there had been one such, and though they “dreamed” that a Bishop might be guilty of *immorality*, and provided for his trial on such an accusation,) and, therefore, no law was made to cover a case not likely ever to occur. And further, Bishops are liable to be called upon to render service in both slaveholding and non-slaveholding States, and should, therefore, be free from an encumbrance which would render them unacceptable to a portion of their people. [Seven or eight hundred other preachers, in the Conferences of *mixed territory* are under the same liability, without, however, exempting them from obligation to that law, or excluding them from its protection.]

To show that the offence of Bishop Andrew was not a trivial or venal one, it is said, “some believed—perhaps few doubted—that sufficient ground existed for an impeachment.” The compromise character of the slavery law, in any proper sense, is denied in the Reply; Bishop Hamline's doctrine that the six restrictive rules are *the constitution*, is fully endorsed, and it is even asserted that “the Church actually came together to form a constitution” in 1808—a statement probably never before made, and a fact, though so very important, probably never before heard of in that form.

It is argued that the Church is not placed in antagonism with State laws by such action as that against Bishop Andrew, because the laws of slaveholding States do not *compel* ministers to become slaveholders, but only *permit* it, and that in like manner, some of them permit gambling, theatres and *grogshops*. The committee omit to state that the laws which *permit* a man to attend theatres or keep a *grogshop*, also freely permit him to cease from that course at any time, and that the law of Georgia, though it ordinarily compels no man to become a slaveholder, (though it may make him such without his consent, which is not true of the other case,) yet having become such, it does not permit him to cease the relation without committing a penal offence, and effecting the re-enslavement of the object of his benevolent action. It is also denied that the episcopacy is a co-ordinate department of the government. And following Bishop Hamline as the committee do, they could reach no other conclusion; for as he gives supremacy to the General Conference in all the departments of government, the idea of a co-ordinate department in any other hands is utterly excluded. Along with this reduction of episcopacy, we have of course, a proportionate elevation of the powers of the General Conference, giving full control of the episcopal office to the extent of suspending or deposing without trial or other formality merely by the will of a majority of that body.

Such, briefly, are the doctrines of the Reply. There were others also, but so obviously unmethodistical that the committee consented to strike them from the document before going to record.

The Reply caused some excitement, and especially the motion to *adopt* it. The whole affair was new: a Reply to a Protest was without precedent,—the doctrines of the Reply were heard at that Conference for the first time, and the idea of *adopting* as the act of the Conference a Reply to a Protest of the minority, which it was their right to make and have recorded without any vote in the case, was entirely novel. But while some of the Southern delegates opposed the adoption, with views such as are alluded to above, others were desirous that if such were really the doctrines of the North, they should be officially avowed by such an act. The motion, however, was varied, and it was proposed to spread the Reply on the Journal and print it, and this motion was carried by a vote of 116 ayes to 26 noes.

Here ended General Conference action on the subject, and the Conference immediately adjourned *sine die*.

CHAPTER III.

From the adjournment of the General Conference of 1844, to the meeting of the Louisville Convention, in May, 1845.

THE General Conference had provided for the organizing of the Conferences in the slaveholding States into a separate ecclesiastical connection, under the jurisdiction of a Southern General Conference, provided those Conferences should find such jurisdictional severance of the general connection *necessary*. It was, therefore, necessary that the sense of those Conferences should be taken on this important question, and to this end some mode of action had to be devised whereby the object might best be attained. Accordingly, as the most eligible manner of proceeding in this conjuncture of affairs, the delegates from the Southern Conferences met together after the adjournment of the General Conference, for consultation. At that meeting, they adopted the following plan of action as proper to be recommended to the Conferences represented by them:—

“With a view to promote uniformity of action in the premises, we beg leave to submit to your consideration the expediency of concurring in the following plan of procuring the judgment of the Church within the slaveholding States, as to the propriety of organizing a Southern division of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States, and of effecting such an organization should it be deemed necessary:—

“1. There shall be a Convention held in Louisville, Kentucky, to commence the 1st May, 1845,—composed of delegates from the several Annual Conferences within the slaveholding States, appointed in the ratio of one for every eleven members.

“2. These delegates shall be appointed at the ensuing session of the several Annual Conferences enumerated, each Conference providing for the expenses of its own delegates.

“3. These several Annual Conferences shall instruct their delegates to the proposed Convention on the points on which action is contemplated—conforming their instructions, as far as possible, to the opinions and wishes of the membership within their several Conference bounds.”

They also sent abroad the following address:—

ADDRESS

*To the Ministers and Members of the Methodist Episcopal Church,
in the Slaveholding States and Territories.*

“The undersigned, delegates in the late General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, from *thirteen* Annual Conferences in slaveholding States and Territories, would most respectfully represent—that the various action of the *majority* of the General Conference, at its recent session, on the subject of *slavery and abolition*, has been such as to render it necessary, in the judgment of those addressing you, to call attention to the *proscription and disability* under which the Southern portion of the Church must of necessity labor in view of the action alluded to, unless some measures are adopted to free the minority of the South from the oppressive jurisdiction of the majority in the North, in this respect.

“The proceedings of the majority, in several cases, involving the question of slavery, have been such as indicate most conclusively that the legislative, judicial and administrative action of the General Conference, as now organized, will always be extremely hurtful, if not finally ruinous, to the interests of the Southern portion of the Church; and must necessarily produce a state of conviction and feeling in the slaveholding States, entirely inconsistent with either the peace or prosperity of the Church.

“The opinions and purposes of the Church in the North on the subject of slavery, are in direct conflict with those of the South, and unless the South will submit to the dictation and interference of the North, greatly beyond what the existing law of the Church on slavery and abolition authorizes, there is no hope of any thing like union or harmony. The debate and action of the General Conference in the case of the Rev. Mr. Harding, of the Baltimore Conference; the debate and action in the case of Bishop Andrew; and the opinions and purposes avowed and indicated in a *manifesto* of the majority, in reply to a *protest* from the minority against the proceedings complained of,—together with hundreds of petitions from the East, North and West, demanding that slavery, in all its possible forms, be separated from the Church;—these, and similar demonstrations, have convinced the undersigned, that they cannot remain silent or inactive without hazard and injustice to the different portions of the Church they represent.

“They have, therefore, thought proper to invoke the attention of the Church in the South to a state of things they are compelled to regard as worthy the immediate notice and action of the Church throughout all the slaveholding States and Territories. The subject of slavery and abolition, notwithstanding

the plain law of the Discipline on the subject, was agitated and debated in the late General Conference, for *five successive weeks*; and even at the very close of the session, the aspect of things was less satisfactory and more threatening to the South than at any former period; and under such circumstances of mutual distrust and disagreement, the General Conference adjourned.

“Some time before the adjournment, however, upon a *declaration* made by the Southern delegations, setting forth the impossibility of enduring such a state of things much longer, the General Conference, by a very large and decided majority, agreed to a *plan of formal and pacific separation*, by which the Southern Conferences are to have a distinct and independent organization of their own, in no way subject to Northern jurisdiction. It affords us pleasure to state that there were those found among the majority who met this proposition with every manifestation of justice and liberality. And should a similar spirit be exhibited by the Annual Conferences in the North, when submitted to them, as provided for in the plan itself, there will remain no legal impediment to its peaceful consummation.

“This plan is approved by the undersigned as the best, and, indeed, all that can be done at present, in remedy of the great evil under which we labor. Provision is made for a peaceable and constitutional division of Church property of every kind. The plan does not decide that division shall take place; but simply, and it is thought securely, provides that it may, if it be found necessary. Of this necessity, you are to be the judges, after a careful survey and comparison of all the reasons for and against it.

“As the undersigned have had opportunity and advantages which those at a distance could not possess, to form a correct judgment in the premises, and it may be expected of them that they express their views fully on the subject, they do not hesitate to say, that they regard a separation at no distant day as inevitable; and farther, that the plan of separation agreed upon is as eligible as the Southern Conferences have any right to expect at any time. We most respectfully, therefore, and with no common solicitude, beseech our brethren of the ministry and membership in the slaveholding States, to examine this matter carefully, and, weighing it well in all its bearings, try to reach the conclusion most proper under the circumstances. Shall that which, in all moral likelihood must take place soon, be attempted now, or are there reasons why it should be postponed?

“We deprecate all excitement; we ask you to be calm and collected, and to approach and dispose of the subject with all

the candor and forbearance the occasion demands. The separation proposed is *not* schism, it is *not* secession. It is a State or family, separating into two different States or families, by mutual consent. As the 'Methodist Episcopal Church' will be found North of the dividing line, so the 'Methodist Episcopal Church' will be found South of the same line.

"The undersigned have clung to the cherished unity of the Church with a firmness of purpose and force of feeling which nothing but invincible necessity could subdue. If, however, nominal unity must co-exist with unceasing strife and alienated feeling, what is likely to be gained by its perpetuation? Every minister and member of the Church in slaveholding States must perceive at once, that the constant, not to say interminable, agitation of the slavery and abolition question in the councils of the Church, and elsewhere, must terminate in incalculable injury to all the Southern Conferences. Our access to slave and master is to a great extent cut off. The legislation of the Church in conflict with that of the State—Church policy attempting to control public opinion and social order—must generate an amount of hostility to the Church, impossible to be overcome, and slowly but certainly to diminish both the means and the hope of usefulness and extension on the part of the Church.

"Disposed, however, to defer to the judgment of the Church, we leave this subject with you. Our first and most direct object has been to bring it fully before you, and giving you an opportunity to judge and determine for yourselves, await your decision. The minority from the South in the late General Conference, were most anxious to adjourn the decision in the case of Bishop Andrew, with all its attendant results, to the Annual Conferences and to the Church at large, to consider and decide upon during the next four years—as no charge was presented against the Bishop, and especially as this measure was urgently recommended by the whole bench of Bishops, although Bishop Hedding subsequently withdrew his name. The proposition, however, to refer the whole subject to the Church, was promptly rejected by the majority, and immediate action demanded and had. But as all the facts connected with the equivocal suspension of Bishop Andrew, will come before you in other forms, it is unnecessary to detail them in this brief address, the main object of which is to place before you, in a summary way, the principal facts and reasons connected with the proposed separation of the Southern Conferences into a distinct organization.

"Adopted at a meeting of the Southern delegations, held in New York, at the close of the General Conference, June 11th, 1844, and ordered to be published.

"Signed on behalf of the Kentucky, Missouri, Holston, Tennessee, North Carolina, Memphis, Arkansas, Virginia, Mississippi, Texas, Alabama, Georgia, and South Carolina Annual Conferences.

"*Kentucky*.—H. B. Bascom, William Gunn, H. H. Kavanaugh, E. Stevenson, B. T. Crouch, G. W. Brush.

"*Missouri*.—W. W. Redman, W. Patton, J. C. Berryman, J. M. Jameson.

"*Holston*.—E. F. Sevier, S. Patton, T. Stringfield.

"*Tennessee*.—R. Paine, J. B. McFerrin, A. L. P. Green, T. Maddin.

"*North Carolina*.—B. T. Blake, J. Jamieson, P. Doub.

"*Memphis*.—G. W. D. Harris, S. S. Moody, W. McMahon, Thomas Joyner.

"*Arkansas*.—J. C. Parker, W. P. Ratcliffe, A. Hunter.

"*Virginia*.—J. Early, T. Crowder, W. A. Smith, L. M. Lee.

"*Mississippi*.—W. Winans, B. M. Drake, J. Lane, G. M. Rogers.

"*Texas*.—Littleton Fowler.

"*Alabama*.—J. Boring, J. Hamilton, W. Murrah, G. Garrett.

"*Georgia*.—G. F. Pierce, W. J. Parks, L. Pierce, J. W. Glenn, J. E. Evans, A. B. Longstreet.

"*South Carolina*.—W. Capers, W. M. Wightman, C. Betts, S. Dunwody, H. A. C. Walker."

Immediately after the adjournment of the General Conference, the central organ of the Church at New York opened a spirited attack on the South, which has been perseveringly sustained with consistent uncharitableness to the present time. One cause of this may or may not have been, that the Southern delegates sought to supercede the editor of that paper, by the election of one who, though less consistent and dignified, has since been no less bitter in his opposition to the rights and interests of the South. The Church papers in the South of course repelled these attacks, and gave free expression of their opinions with regard to the proceedings of the General Conference. The membership, too, in many places in the South, met in primary assemblies and uttered their disapprobation of those proceedings in strong language. And doubtless it is but a concession of candor, to admit that in many cases quite too much uncharitableness and even severity were indulged in. It is but just, at the same time, to remark, that before the time arrived for the Southern Conferences to take official action on the subject of division, the popular excitement had very much abated; and it is believed that in the action of those Conferences but little is to be found, to which, under all the circumstances, just censure can attach. And it is by the official action of the Southern Annual Conferences, and not by the ex-

cited expressions of individuals or unofficial assemblies, that the true temper of the South, at the time of acting on the question of division, should be judged of. The Resolutions and Reports or Addresses, therefore, of the Conferences in the slaveholding States, on the subject of a separate jurisdiction, properly constitute a part of the history of the Southern organization; and they are accordingly inserted.

The Kentucky Conference was the first in the Southern division of the Church to meet after the adjournment of the General Conference. It convened on the 11th of September, 1844, and adopted the following Resolutions, with but one dissenting vote:—

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON DIVISION.

“The committee to whom was referred the subject of the division of the Church into two separate General Conference jurisdictions and kindred subjects, have had the same under serious consideration, and beg leave to report:

“That enlightened as the Conference is presumed to be, on the merits of the very important subject upon which your committee have been called to act, it was not deemed expedient to delay this report by an elaborate and argumentative investigation of the matters committed to them, in their various relations, principles and bearings; they, therefore, present the result of their deliberations to the Conference by offering for adoption the following resolutions:—

“1. *Resolved*, That it is the deliberate judgment of this Conference that the action of the late General Conference, virtually deposing Bishop Andrew, and also their action in confirming the decision of the Baltimore Conference, in the case of the Rev. F. A. Harding, are not sustained by the Discipline of our Church, and that we consider those proceedings as constituting a highly dangerous precedent.

“2. *Resolved*, That we deeply regret the prospect of division growing out of these proceedings, and that we do most sincerely hope and pray that some effectual means, not inconsistent with the interests and honor of all concerned, may be suggested and devised by which so great a calamity may be averted, and to this end we recommend that our societies be freely consulted on the subject.

“3. *Resolved*, That we approve the holding of a Convention of delegates from the Conferences in the slaveholding States, in the city of Louisville, on the first day of May next, agreeably to the recommendation of the Southern and South-western delegates in the late General Conference; and that the ratio of representation proposed by said delegates, to wit, one delegate for every eleven members of Conference, be and the

same is hereby adopted; and that this Conference will elect delegates to the proposed Convention upon said basis.

"4. *Resolved*, That should a division be found to be indispensable, the delegates of this Conference are hereby required to act under the following instructions, to wit: that the Southern and South-western Conferences shall not be regarded as a secession from the Methodist Episcopal Church, but that they shall be recognized in law, and to all intents and purposes, as a co-ordinate branch of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States of America, simply acting under a separate jurisdiction. And further, that being well satisfied with the Discipline of the Church as it is, this Conference instruct its delegates not to support or favor any change in said Discipline by said Convention.

"5. *Resolved*, That unless we can be assured that the rights of our ministry and membership can be effectually secured according to Discipline, against future aggressions, and reparation be made for past injury, we shall deem the contemplated division unavoidable.

"6. *Resolved*, That we approve the course of our delegates in the late General Conference in the premises, and that we tender them our thanks for their faithful and independent discharge of duty in a trying crisis.

"7. *Resolved*, That the secretary of this Conference be directed to have these resolutions published in such of our Church papers as may be willing to insert them.

"All of which is respectfully submitted.

"M. M. HENKLE, *Chairman*."

FURTHER ACTION IN REFERENCE TO THE CONTEMPLATED CONVENTION.

"*Resolved, by the Kentucky Annual Conference*, That should the proposed Convention, representing the Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, in the slaveholding States, appointed to assemble in the city of Louisville, the first of May, 1845, proceed to a separate organization, as contingently provided for in the resolutions of this body on yesterday, then and in that event, the Convention shall be regarded as the regular General Conference, authorized and appointed by the several Annual Conferences of the Southern division of the Church, and as possessing all the rights, powers and privileges of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States, and subject to the same restrictions, limitations and restraints.

"*Resolved*, That in order to secure the constitutional character and action of the Convention as a General Conference proper, should a separate organization take place, the ratio of representation as now found in the 2d restrictive rule, one for

every twenty-one, shall prevail and determine the number of constitutional delegates, taking and accrediting as such the proper number from each Annual Conference first elected in order, and that the supernumerary delegates be regarded as members of the Convention to deliberate, etc., but not members of the General Conference proper, should the Convention proceed to a separate organization in the South—*Provided*, nevertheless, that should any delegate or delegates, who would not be excluded from the General Conference proper, by the operation of the above regulation be absent, then any delegate or delegates present, not admitted by said regulation as member or members of the constitutional General Conference, may lawfully take the seat or seats of such absent delegates, upon the principle of the selection named above.

“Resolved, by the Kentucky Annual Conference, That we respectfully invite the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, who may feel themselves disposed to do so, to be in attendance at the contemplated Convention, to be held in the city of Louisville, Ky., in May, 1845.

“Resolved, by the Kentucky Annual Conference, That we appoint the Friday immediately preceding the day fixed for the meeting of the proposed General Convention of the delegates of the Conferences, as a day of fasting and prayer for the blessing of Almighty God on the said Convention.”

Before its final adjournment, the Conference also appointed a committee to address the members of the Methodist Episcopal Church within the bounds of the Kentucky Conference. The following is their address:—

ADDRESS

To the Members of the Methodist Episcopal Church within the bounds of the Kentucky Annual Conference.

“Dear Brethren,—The Kentucky Annual Conference was called on at its late session to take action relative to the doings of the late General Conference. That action has been published, and with its character you are presumed to be acquainted. But as the resolutions of the Conference have gone forth without any thing explanatory of the reasons or principles upon which they are based, it was deemed advisable to appoint a committee, charged with the duty of addressing the Churches under our care on this very important subject; and that responsible service was, by the Conference, committed to the undersigned. In discharge of that trust, we address ourselves at once to the task assigned us.

“From the first planting of Methodism in what are now the Southern States of the American Union, domestic slavery, which was intimately incorporated in the constitution of South-

ern society, connected itself with the Church, and so continues. A strong desire was early manifested by the authorities of the Church, and repeated efforts were made, to divorce this connection, but without success. After varying the modes of action, and changing the law into every form that might afford hope of success, it was found utterly impracticable, and became perfectly certain that so long as we had a Church in the South, we must have slavery in the Church; for every day ministers and members were becoming slaveholders—involuntarily, by inheritance and bequest, and voluntarily, by matrimonial alliances, in the exercise of a freedom of choice which the Church had no right, and generally no disposition, to control or intermeddle with. In this posture of affairs the relaxation of the early and more rigorous rules on the subject of slavery, or the total abandonment of the South, became the alternatives between which the Church had to select.

“Yielding to uncontrollable necessity, the North and South at length compromised their conflicting sentiments on a plan which held ministers and official members legally responsible for holding slaves, where State laws permitted their emancipation, and repealed all laws subjecting private members to penalties for a connection with slavery. This, however, did not operate as a permanent adjustment of the controversy; for many brethren of the North, regarding slavery under all circumstances as sinful, sought its utter banishment from the Church, in all possible forms, while those of the South believed it impossible to go any farther than the requirements of the rule. The North felt aggrieved that slavery was permitted to exist in the Church at all, and the South felt aggrieved in being uniformly proscribed with regard to offices in the gift of the General Conference, on account of their connection with slavery, even though they kept themselves strictly within the law of the Church.

“In this state of things, entire cordiality was not to be expected; and accordingly the meetings of General Conference were looked to with unpleasant apprehension, if not actual dread; and those meetings were generally attended with many things of a disagreeable character, arising out of this standing subject of contention and disagreement.

“This irreconcilable disagreement of opinion, especially when taken in connection with the vast and widening extent of our field of operation, apart from any other cause, might well have suggested the propriety of an attempt to prosecute our great work under separate General Conference jurisdictions, as being more favorable to the general harmony and tranquillity of the connection. Such a proposition, too, might have received further countenance and support from the fact,

that the popular construction of the rule on the 'general itinerant superintendency' of the Church, required our Bishops severally to travel over the whole extent of this vast country, consuming in toilsome and expensive travel much time which might otherwise be bestowed in more efficient and profitable labor. There was, however, a disposition to submit to privations and make sacrifices to preserve the integrity of the union—the unity of American Methodism. And it is probable that the South would long have consented to be a subordinate and proscribed division of the connection, rather than separate from their brethren of the North, had nothing more influential and imperative than the general causes adverted to occurred to change that purpose. But circumstances transpired at the late General Conference which hastened the crisis, and seemed to point with unerring truth to the necessity of immediate and decisive action on this subject.

"The law regulating the connection of traveling preachers with slavery, evidently contemplated their special liability to become so connected by bequest, inheritance, and marriage. In these several ways had a Bishop of the Church become involved in slavery; in the first two, without any violation or concurrence on his part, and in the third, by following his judgment and affections in selecting the wife of his bosom. The law of the Church recognized his right to make the acquisition, the law of the State bound the incumbrance upon him, and in that contingency the law of the Church had no farther demands upon him, but legalized the holding. This would have been the view of every one, and here would probably have been a perpetual end of the matter, but for one fact; that was, that though the Church law was satisfied and complied with, the proscriptive usage of the North towards ministers of the South, was impinged, and in danger of becoming unsettled by the circumstance. That usage was, to put no man into high office, especially the episcopacy, who was in any way connected with slavery, no matter how involuntarily. But here was a Bishop who had become involved in slavery after elevation to the episcopate; and to suffer him to remain in office in this state of things might have operated to place Southern ministers on a ground of equality with those of the North, almost as effectually as if he had been elected under the circumstances providentially thrown around him subsequently. To put Bishop Andrew out of the episcopate, therefore, or in some way to punish him for this act, became the all-absorbing concern of the dominant party in the General Conference. But how this was to be done, was a question of great difficulty. Three several plans were suggested—'direct impeachment;' an official request to resign, and such a request to suspend the

exercise of his episcopal functions until the obstacle in question should be removed. 'It was believed,' and with good reason, that 'a direct impeachment' could have been sustained, because the votes were there in numbers sufficient to do it, with or without law, but it was not by any means so clear that the measure would be sustained by the Church at large and by the sense of the general community, and it was accordingly not attempted. The plan of requesting the Bishop, by General Conference resolution, to resign, was therefore brought into Conference as the most eligible one; but was finally abandoned by its originators and original advocates, and the party threw themselves on the third alternative, that of requesting the Bishop not to exercise the functions of his office, while connected with slavery. Perhaps this last measure was preferred because it would put the Bishop quite as effectually, and a little more directly, into their power, than the preceding one.

"But an obstacle stood in the way of inflicting punishment on Bishop Andrew for his providential connection with slavery. The only law by which Bishop Andrew could be punished was the law applying to itinerant ministers; but with that he had strictly complied, and of course was entitled to its protection. It was then indispensably necessary to take him from under the protection of the law by which they had just then punished an itinerant minister, and this could be only done by denying that a Bishop is an itinerant minister. This astonishing position was clearly taken, and attempted to be maintained, by the majority of the General Conference. That a Bishop is an itinerant minister in fact cannot be denied by any man enjoying right reason, and that he is so in law is nearly as clear. For more than fifty years from the organization of the Church, Bishops received their compensation under the law making provision for traveling preachers; but because the General Conference of 1836—probably to meet a cavil, or to gratify a whim—added the word 'bishops' to 'traveling and superannuated preachers,' in the salary law, the majority Reply to the Southern Protest maintains, that therefore a Bishop is not an itinerant preacher. The argument would prove with stronger reason, that superannuated preachers are not in law itinerant; for they, as well as Bishops, are separately named in the salary law; and besides, they do not actually itinerate, which Bishops do.

"But if the Bishop was removed by the power of this strange argument, from under the protection of the law in question, then there is no other law that can apply to the case; he is under no law whatever with regard to this matter. And for so remarkable a relation some cause must be shown, and this the dominant party have attempted in their Reply to the Protest,

by assuming that at the time the law was enacted, 'the North and South did not *dream* that slavery would ever find its way into the episcopacy,' and accordingly no provision was made for such a contingency! The law then enacted, supposed that Bishops might be guilty of immorality of every grade, and it made provision for their punishment on conviction of such offences; and yet, though Bishop Hamline informs us that the offence of Bishop Andrew was 'a shade less than imprudence,' our fathers, we are to be told, 'never dreamed that a Bishop could be guilty of such an offence!' The first Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church had been publicly charged with being the purchaser and holder of slaves, for a time; and he himself did not deny, but rather confessed the fact; and yet in view of this fact, our fathers could not dream that a Bishop could ever be guilty of such an offence!

The more effectually to exclude the Bishop the pale and protection of the traveling preachers' law, we are told in the 'Reply' that 'In the case of ordinary traveling preachers there appeared to be a necessity for some indulgence. They might become owners of slaves in the providence of God, the laws of the States might not allow emancipation, and they had no power to choose their own place of residence. But no such reason could apply to a Bishop, who has always been allowed to reside where he pleased.' But may not a Bishop also become the owner of slaves in the providence of God? Was not this the case with Bishop Andrew? And may not State laws prevent a Bishop from emancipating his slaves as effectually as any other preacher or any other man? We cannot therefore, see the force of this argument. And though 'a Bishop may reside where he pleases,' yet they are selected with more or less reference to locality, and they would not promote their usefulness or increase their influence by abandoning the locality from which they were selected, with a view to accommodate some popular or local prejudice. And this doctrine, to have any weight at all, must imply an obligation on all our Bishops, not residing in the North, to remove there immediately on their election. It is the doctrine of expatriation, which should be repudiated by every man of correct principles and feeling. But even suppose this were done by a Southern Bishop, this would not prevent the law from devolving slaves on him by inheritance, nor prevent his old friends in the South from bequeathing them to him; nor should it prevent him from going among the friends of his youth to select a companion.

"But farther to prove that the law for traveling preachers is not severe enough for Bishops, the majority Reply says, 'Preachers incumbered with slavery labor among people similarly situated, and who would not be likely to object to them on

that account. But a Bishop is required to labor in every part of the connection, [i. e., in slaveholding and non-slaveholding districts,] and in by far the larger part the services of a slaveholding Bishop would be unacceptable.' But it is not true that Bishops are the only preachers who have to labor in both slaveholding and non-slaveholding portions of the work. More than *seven hundred* of our preachers labor in Conferences embracing both classes of territory, and are quite as liable to have work among the two classes referred to as Bishops are. What, therefore, is assigned as a reason why Bishops should be excluded from the provisions and protection of the law, applies with equal force to more than seven hundred other preachers.

"In this way the Bishop is taken out of the statute, and by arguments no more cogent and conclusive than these, a decree of ecclesiastical *outlawry* is attempted to be justified.

"But having with strong arm, taken the Bishop from under the law, the next measure to be provided for—and a very important one—was to show right, or justification for inflicting punishment *without law*. The exercise of such a power is one of the distinguishing attributes of despotism. And whether it be exercised by one man or an hundred, the principle is the same: the will of the ruling authority unrestricted is the law of action; and that will is liable to be biassed by interest, prejudice, or passion, and especially in times of high excitement.

"It was not to be expected that so fearful a prerogative, now for the first time asserted, would be quite tamely acquiesced in by the Church at large; unless strongly fortified by conclusive reasoning. To defend this position, then, became a prominent link in the strong chain of power forged by the dominant party in the last General Conference. To this end two processes are resorted to; the episcopal office is degraded, beyond all precedent of friend or foe, and the powers of the General Conference magnified in equal ratio. It is accordingly held that a Bishop is the mere creature and servant of the General Conference, and not the officer of the whole Church, as every body up to this time had supposed. He is not appointed during life or good behavior, as has always been held by the whole Church and the whole world, but simply during the arbitrary pleasure of the General Conference; who in the true spirit of the old continental despots, appoint him *durante bene placito*. He continues in office not in virtue of his election or ordination, of talents, faithfulness, or piety, but in virtue of pleasing—we may add, *humoring*—the majority of the General Conference! And so trivial a matter is the deposing of a Bishop now considered by the dominant party, that Mr. Hamline, a leader and now a Bishop of that party, places it on the same ground with the changing of a class leader, an act provided for by express law,

and required in certain cases as a part of the pastor's regular duty. If our Northern brethren are opposed to our episcopacy, let them avow that opposition frankly and independently, but let them not murder it by inches, under professions of friendliness to the office.

"But while the episcopacy is thus degraded, the General Conference is exalted into an enormous irresponsible aristocracy, at whose feet the episcopacy must bow in submissive, not to say abject, dependence. The General Conference claims not only the possession of supreme legislative and judicial power, but in the language of Bishop Hamline 'executive functions, supreme and all controlling.' And the same high authority asserts, with the apparent concurrence of the Northern party, that the General Conference may at any time, 'in ten minutes,' constitutionally alter or abrogate any or every part of the economy of Methodism, save only the very few things protected by the six restrictions. Itinerancy, love feasts, class meetings, and every thing time-honored, venerable, and sacred in Methodism, is at the mercy and caprice of that body. When the leading doctors of the Church claim for the General Conference, powers more monstrous and despotic than any opposers of our economy have ever dared to charge that body with holding, how can the Church be defended against the attacks of her friends? Well may she say 'Defend me against my friends, and I will defend myself against my enemies.'

"This dangerous claim to irresponsible power appears to be chiefly based on the novel and astonishing assumption, that the six restrictive regulations adopted by the General Conference of 1808, is '*the constitution* of the Church,' and that, therefore, whatever they do not prohibit, the General Conference has full and rightful power to do.

"It is not material whether we call any specified part of our system a *constitution* or not. Until recently, no part was so designated in Methodist parlance—and it is well known that at the time the six restrictions were adopted, and for many years afterwards, they were not spoken of as a constitution. They have been respected, and properly so, as of constitutional force, though lacking in some of the elements of constitutional character. But 'the constitution of the Church' they are not. The Reply to the Protest, however, asserts, 'that the Church actually did come together [in 1808] to frame a constitution,' and these six very short paragraphs are pointed to as the grand result of their constitutional labors. That General Conference was constituted in all respects as its immediate predecessor of 1804, with no other or different powers, and for no different purposes, save that some expectation was entertained in certain quarters, that the Conference of that year, as a matter of

convenience, in view of the extent of the connection, would provide for a reduction of the members in subsequent General Conferences, by giving them a delegated character. This they did, and out of it grew the six restrictions. And this is the sole ground upon which is based the bold and unsupported declaration just quoted from the 'Reply.'

"The truth is, if we employ the term constitution to signify a regular written frame work of government, then we have no Church constitution; for not only truth, but respect for the dead and living patriarchs of the Church would restrain us from asserting or admitting that 'the Church actually came together to frame [such] a constitution,' and produced nothing but the few lines dignified by our Northern brethren with the title of 'the constitution,' but which our fathers of that time 'never dreamed' of calling by such a name or investing with such attributes.

"But if we employ the term in its more legitimate sense, as implying the permanent ground work and fundamental elements of a system, upon which, and by which it is *constituted*, then we can boast a constitution of solid base and ample provisions. The grand constitutional elements of our Methodism consist not chiefly of 'restrictions,' but of regulations long and well approved, usages permanently settled, and whatever essentially *constitutes* the system, such as itinerancy, class meetings, and so forth. These, though not guarded by the restrictive rules, the General Conference has no power, moral or constitutional, to destroy; for they are essential to the existence of the system, and therefore constitutional in it.

"Doctrines such as we have been reviewing, we cannot but regard as dangerous, and calculated to unsettle the foundations of the Church. With these high powers claimed by the General Conference, what assurance can we have that at the next meeting of that body, some other high functionary, will not, under some other excitement, or the same, be dragged down from his elevation, to bend before the General Conference supremacy, or be crushed by its giant power? And what assurance can we have that from pulling down great officers, they will not, under the power of some new impulse, no more unexpected than the last, proceed to pulling up the great pillars of Wesleyan Methodism?

"Our brethren of the North, we are aware, deny, in their 'Reply,' that any punishment whatever has been inflicted on Bishop Andrew; but it is a strange denial. The action in his case, they assert, 'was neither judicial nor punitive. It neither achieves nor intends a deposition, nor so much as a legal suspension.' 'Bishop Andrew,' they say, 'has been subjected to no trial, and no penalty has been inflicted.' That he has been punished,

is a plain matter of fact, which no subtilty of abstract speculation can change or disprove, and we do not suppose the rigors of that infliction will find much mitigation in the fact here asserted, that it was done without trial. Has not the General Conference inflicted a deep wound on the reputation and feelings of Bishop Andrew in officially requesting him not to exercise the functions of his office, and in refusing to authorize the episcopal board to assign him work? And had they expelled him from the Church, they could have inflicted no other *kinds* of punishment than those he has been subjected to, though it would have differed in *degree*. Is not a mode of punishing a preacher for some dereliction of duty, or commission of misdemeanor, to 'leave him without an appointment for one year'? This is done avowedly as a punishment; and how can our brethren assert that it was no punishment to a Bishop to be 'left without an appointment' virtually for life? But it is assumed that he is yet a Bishop, and therefore is unpunished. It is true he is a Bishop in name, but so far as they are concerned, in nothing else. So the allied powers were willing that Napoleon should still wear the empty title of Emperor, while they carefully divested him of all imperial power, and sent him to pine and die in desolate banishment, on the dreary rock of St. Helena, as a state prisoner.

"With such action taken, and such doctrines avowed, it had not been astonishing if the Southern delegates had given up all for lost. Yet even thus situated they sought peace, and proposed every honorable compromise. They offered a pledge that Bishop Andrew should free himself from slavery as soon as the law of the State would permit it. This was promptly rejected. They proposed that Bishop Andrew should labor only where it was known that he would be acceptable. This, too, was rejected, though immediately afterwards they elected a man to the same office, in whose case they of course knew they would be, as they have been, compelled to make the same arrangement. The episcopal board unanimously recommended that the case be laid over for four years, until the Conferences and the Church could have time to pass action upon it; in the mean time allowing Bishop Andrew to exercise the functions of his office. And the same proposition had previously come from the South, limited to one year. But both were unceremoniously rejected by a vast majority. After the vote inflicting punishment on Bishop Andrew had been passed, the Bishops virtually asked permission to employ him in the field of episcopal labor; but this the General Conference refused, as it did every proposition looking towards compromise or amicable adjustment of the difficulty.

"It was also well known to the Southern delegates, that a very general determination in the North was, never to allow

this subject to rest, until they had, to use their own language, 'entirely purged, not only the episcopacy, but the ministry and membership from the last vestige of slavery.' They knew that the action in the case of Bishop Andrew, oppressive as it was, was only designed as an entering wedge, and that so far as human foresight could go, aided by nearly infallible indications, if the action in that case had been tamely acquiesced in, or submitted to, that at each succeeding General Conference the proceedings against the South would become more and more oppressive and proscriptive, until that portion of the Church would be compelled to separate from the North, or submit to proceedings which must utterly exterminate the Church in the South.

"So circumstanced, it would seem impossible for the Southern delegates to have pursued any other course than that of declaring for a peaceable separation and an organization under a Southern Conference jurisdiction. This they did, and have requested the Kentucky Annual Conference, with others in the South, to take action on the subject, which we have done.

"To such a division, there is in our feelings a strong and natural aversion. This we experience in the division of an Annual Conference, a circuit, a station, or even a class, and of course much more in a General Conference division. But our sober judgment with regard to the good of the whole, and not our feelings, should be the guide of our action.

"If division can be avoided safely and honorably, it should by all means be done. But how is it to be done? Will the South consent, will Kentucky Conference consent, after the unlawful degradation of Bishop Andrew, and after the avowal of doctrines and claim of powers by the last General Conference so new, dangerous and unmethodistical, to submit to all, remaining in our present humbled position, and wait four years in agitation and suspense in the vain and groundless hope that the next General Conference will act any more favorably to the South than the last,—and that with the certain assurance that that General Conference will act more proscriptively than any one that has preceded it? Probably no one will contend for this. But compromise is suggested. Pending the action in the case of Bishop Andrew the South proposed every form of compromise not dishonorable, and were met with prompt repulse. Now that they have taken action in a form and under circumstances which make it imply a power and right to destroy the character and standing of any minister in the South at pleasure, they are probably willing to compromise on their own terms; that is, they may consent to receive our unconditional submission; but we fear this is all.

"But it is conjectured that the Conferences and people of

the North may be more liberal in their views than the members of the late General Conference, and that they may favor an honorable compromise, and open the way for a perpetuation of our union. This is, we fear, a more groundless hope. Several of the Northern Conferences and primary assemblies of the people, have already spoken out on this subject, and all who have, approve in the strongest terms the doings of the General Conference, save where those proceedings were not sufficiently severe against the South, to suit their views. The Church papers of the North afford no better hope. By far the most mild and conciliatory of them, has commenced an elaborate and wholesale justification and defence of the doings of the General Conference. The great central organ of the Church, which has in the South a circulation of thousands, not only fully justifies the General Conference, but has labored to make the impression that its proceedings were extremely lenient, and that Bishop Andrew might in justice have been much more severely dealt with; while the paper at Boston is still more ultra and violent against the South. Where then is hope for a compromise, short of unconditional submission? There have, it is true, appeared a few individual propositions and one or two from Church meetings, suggesting plans of compromise; but none of these are at all as reasonable in themselves, or as favorable or acceptable to the North, as those they so promptly rejected.

“There then appears no just and honorable alternative left, but a peaceable organization of two General Conferences. This is called a division of the Church; but it is not so in the offensive and repulsive sense in which it is frequently used.—The same doctrines, ordinances, means of grace, modes of operating, and even the same disciplinary rules probably—save wherein the North may depart from our present system—will govern both, only like Abram and Lot, and from the same motives, we propose, if compelled, to turn the one to the right and the other to the left, that separated *farther* asunder we may enjoy *closer* union. Already we have several Methodist Churches, or divisions of the great Methodist family existing in separated union, in divided harmony, which are by no means as nearly related to each other as the Northern and Southern divisions of the Methodist Episcopal Church would be. The British Methodist connection, that of Canada, and our own in the United States, are entirely separate and independent, holding, to be sure, the same doctrines, but operating under different systems of Church polity, widely varying from each other in many things, yet constituting one great and perfectly harmonious brotherhood.

“But we find many of our Northern brethren, and some of

the Northern Conferences, protesting against a division on the ground that there is no legal provision for such division. This objection comes not with the very best grace from the men who had neither legal nor moral scruples about degrading a Bishop without law and against law,—who claim for the General Conference the legal power to change or destroy every thing in Methodism not embraced in the restrictions. This measure is not there prohibited, and therefore, agreeably to their own doctrine, the General Conference has ‘full power’ to do this very thing.

“But we have a still stronger precedent, and one as full in point as we could ask for our purpose. The Canadian Methodists were for a great number of years a part of the Methodist Episcopal Church. In 1828, they applied to the General Conference to be set off into a separate Church organization, and the General Conference granted their request; but not in the indirect manner proposed in the present case. The resolution dissolving the union between the Church and the Canada Conference is as follows:—

“*Resolved, &c., That the compact existing between the Canada Annual Conference and the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States, be, and hereby is, dissolved by mutual consent.*”

“The second resolution advises and requests our Bishops to ordain a Bishop for the Canada connection. The third advises or recommends to the Canada connection to adopt the form of government of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States, ‘with such modifications as their particular relations may render necessary.’ The fourth expresses a desire for the maintenance of friendly relations with the new organization. The fifth leaves open the claim of the Canada brethren on the Book Concern and Chartered Fund for future adjustment. But it was afterwards closed by agreeing to pay them an annuity of \$700. Here is the direct exercise of powers greater than are called for or proposed to be exercised in the present case. A portion of the Church is set off by a formal vote into a new connection, and their dividend is given them without any change in the sixth restriction, or any thing but a simple resolve of the General Conference. They either then had full powers to do this thing, or they assumed the exercise of powers not belonging to them, which has not been charged. And if they possessed the power then, why have they it not now? One only plea is urged in favor of that action as giving a preference over the present in point of legality. It is that in sending preachers to Canada the Bishop usually got the supply by calling for volunteers, instead of appointing them in the ordinary way. But could the exercise of this prudent lenity on the part of the

Bishop, in filling a new and arduous field, have any bearing on the constitutionality of dividing that field off into a separate connection? But if it could, then it will apply to all parts of our work which were once new and difficult; for it has been the constant practice to supply new fields of labor by volunteers. New England was so supplied in early times, and so was all the South below Virginia, or at most North Carolina; the entire West and Southwest were so supplied, and this mode of supply is yet going on in our still far West, Arkansas, Texas, Oregon, &c. Nearly the whole, then, of the Southern portion of the proposed division, comes within this rule, if it were even possible to allow it any force.

“In view of all the facts and circumstances in the case, the Kentucky Annual Conference have felt compelled to declare, that devotedly as we are attached to the union, unless our Northern brethren shall show a respect for our rights and circumstances and the interests of the Church in the South very different from that shown at the late General Conference, in self-defence, and to save the Church in the South from utter extermination, we shall be obliged, though reluctantly, to place ourselves under a General Conference jurisdiction, distinct from that of the North, but strictly on the Discipline and within the constitution in all things.

“And now, brethren, having presented this grave matter to you in such manner as appeared to be just and proper, we call upon you to bestow on the subject the serious and candid attention its importance demands. But in that consideration, be careful to avoid on the one hand, the influence of an anxious desire for division, and on the other a vague and terrifying dread of it. The one tends to improper rashness and precipitancy, the other to a tame surrender of sacred rights, and a degrading unconditional submission. This fearful crisis has been brought upon us, not by ourselves, but by the unbridled ultraism of our Northern brethren; and it is for us to do the best we can in this emergency. Theirs is the onerous responsibility, before heaven and earth, of bringing us into most trying difficulties—ours the responsibility of conducting ourselves worthy our Christian profession and our cause, under those difficulties.

“To us it does appear, that the delegates from the Southern and South-western Conferences could not have done less than they did, without sacrificing the best religious interests of the South, and most of all, those of the slave, the professed object of Northern sympathy.

“After the majority of the General Conference, in the opinion of the Southern delegates, had violated not only the settled usage of the Church, but the unambiguous letter of the

law, in the case of Mr. Harding—after they had refused to Bishop Andrew the protection of all Church law, and assumed and exercised the power of inflicting punishment without law, —had the Southern delegates tamely submitted to all, what must have been the result? In the first place, doubtless multitudes of the Southern membership would have felt themselves compelled to secede from the Church immediately.

“The next would inevitably have been, that Methodist preachers would have been promptly excluded from all access to the slave population of the South, and this great open door of usefulness would have been firmly closed. And beside, it would have invited to further aggressions on the part of the North.

“Now if our Northern brethren will make suitable reparation for the past, and afford satisfactory security for the future, as expressed in our fifth Conference resolution, then will we gladly hail them as brethren beloved, with whom we will hold it a privilege to live and die; but short of this, the union as it now is, could only be a *bond of discord*.

“But whatever may be our action or the final result, let us exhibit the gentleness and moderation of Christianity throughout; and let us neither say nor do any thing in relation to the subject, upon which we cannot devoutly implore the blessing of God.

“We believe our Northern brethren seriously in error in this matter. We do know assuredly, that the measures they seem so solicitous to adopt in relation to the South, would effect the ruin of the Church in the South, and blight forever the best hopes of the slaves who look to us for help in the way of salvation.

“Yet we accord to them honesty and sincerity—ask of them the same liberality, or rather justice. We wish to live with them under a common jurisdiction; but if they will not permit this but on terms involving the ruin of the Church in the South, then we ask to remain as brethren still, but under separate jurisdictions.

“We invite them to join us, at least, in humbly asking the blessing of God on the South and North, and his direction and gracious guidance in the present trials, that all may result in the promotion of his glory, and the great good of the Church.

“M. M. HENKLE,

“T. N. RALSTON,

“B. H. M'COWN.”

The Missouri Conference adopted the following report and resolutions from the Committee on division:—

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON DIVISION.

“The committee to whom was referred the subject of a

division of the Church into two separate General Conference jurisdictions, together with the causes and circumstances connected with the same, have bestowed upon it, in the most prayerful and religious manner, all the time and attention they could command for the purpose, and beg leave to present the following as their report:—

“That inasmuch as the Conference is presumed to be well informed on the merits of the very important subject upon which the committee has been called to act, it was not deemed necessary to delay this report by an extended and argumentative investigation of the matters committed to them, in their various relations, principles, and bearings; they would, therefore, present the result of their deliberations to the Conference by offering for adoption the following resolutions:—

“*Resolved*, That we have looked for many years, with painful apprehension and disapproval upon the agitation of the slavery and abolition subject in our General Conference, and now behold with sorrow and regret, the disastrous results which it has brought about.

“*Resolved*, That while we accord to the great majority of our Northern brethren the utmost purity of intention, and while we would carefully refrain from all harsh denunciations, we are compelled to pronounce the proceedings of the late General Conference against Bishop Andrew, extra-judicial and oppressive.

“*Resolved*, That we deeply regret the prospect of separation growing out of these proceedings, and that we do most sincerely hope and pray that some effectual means not inconsistent with the interests and honor of all concerned, may be suggested and devised, by which so great a calamity may be averted; and to this end we recommend that our societies be freely consulted on this subject.

“*Resolved*, That we approve the holding of a convention of delegates from the Conferences in the slaveholding States, in the city of Louisville, Kentucky, on the 1st day of May next, agreeably to the recommendation of the delegates from the Southern and South-western Conferences, in the late General Conference; and that the ratio of representation proposed by said delegates, to wit, one delegate for every eleven members of the Conference, be, and the same is hereby adopted; and that this Conference will elect delegates to the proposed convention upon said basis.

“*Resolved*, That our delegates act under the following instructions, to wit: to oppose the division of the Church, unless such division, under all the circumstances of the case, be found to be indispensable, (and consequently unavoidable;) and should such necessity be found to exist, and the division be determined

on, then and in that event, that the Southern and South-western Conferences shall not be regarded as a secession from the Methodist Episcopal Church, but that they shall be recognised in law, and to all intents and purposes, as a co-ordinate branch of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States of America, simply acting under a separate jurisdiction. And further, that being well satisfied with the Discipline of the Church as it is, this Conference instruct its delegates not to support or favor any change in said Discipline by said convention.

“Resolved, That unless we can be assured that the rights of our ministry and membership can be effectually secured according to the Discipline, against future aggressions, we shall deem the contemplated division as unavoidable.

“Resolved, That should the proposed convention, representing the Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the slaveholding States, appointed to assemble at the city of Louisville, Kentucky, the 1st of May, 1845, proceed to a separate organization, as contingently provided for in the foregoing resolutions, then in that event, the Convention shall be regarded as the regular General Conference, authorized and appointed by the several Annual Conferences of the Southern division of the Church, and as possessing all the rights, powers, and privileges of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States of America, and subject to the same restrictions, limitations, and restraints.

“Resolved, That in order to secure the constitutional character and action of the convention as a General Conference proper, should a separate organization take place, the ratio of representation as now found in the second restrictive rule, one for every twenty-one, shall prevail and determine the constitutional delegates, taking and accrediting as such the proper number from each Annual Conference, first elected in order, and that the supernumerary delegates be regarded as members of the convention to deliberate, but not members of the General Conference proper, should the convention proceed to a separate organization in the South. *Provided,* nevertheless, that should any delegate or delegates who would not be excluded from the General Conference proper, by the operation of the above regulation, be absent, then any delegate or delegates present, not admitted by said regulations as a member or members of the constitutional General Conference, may lawfully take the seat or seats of such absent delegates, upon the principle of selection named above.

“Resolved, That we have read with deep regret the violent proceedings of some of our Southern brethren, in their primary meetings, against some of our Bishops and others; and that

we do most cordially invite to our pulpits and firesides all our Bishops and Northern brethren, who, in the event of a division, shall belong to the Northern Methodist Episcopal Church.

Resolved, That the preachers shall take up public collections in all their circuits and stations, some time before the first day of March next, for the purpose defraying the expenses of the delegates to the above named convention, and pay over the same to the delegates, or the respective presiding elders, so that the delegates may receive the same before starting to the convention.

<p>“WM. PATTEN, “ANDREW MONROE, “J. BOYLE, “W. W. REDMAN, “JOHN GLANNVILLE, “E. PERKINS, “T. W. CHANDLER, “JAS. G. T. DUNLEAVY, “JOHN THATCHER,</p>	}	<i>Committee.”</i>
---	---	--------------------

The following resolutions were offered, and immediately adopted by the Conference:—

Resolved, That we approve the course of our delegates in their action at the late General Conference, in the case of Bishop Andrew, and the part they took in the subsequent acts of the Southern delegates, growing out of the proceedings of the majority, and they are hereby entitled to our hearty thanks for their manly course in a trying crisis.

Resolved, That we invite the Bishops of our Church, who may feel free to do so, and they are hereby invited, to attend the contemplated convention at Louisville, Ky.

“J. H. LINN,
 “R. BOYD.”

The Holston Conference adopted the following report and resolutions from the Committee on Separation:—

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON SEPARATION.

“The committee to whom was referred the subject of Church separation and other matters connected therewith, would respectfully submit the following report:—

“In common with our brethren all over our widely extended Zion, our hearts are exceedingly pained at the prospect of disunion, growing out of the action of the late General Conference in the case of Bishop Andrew. Your committee believe this action to be extra-judicial, and forming a highly dangerous precedent. The aspect of affairs at the close of the General Conference, was indeed gloomy; and while we have sought for light from every possible source, we cannot believe that our Church papers are the true expo-

nents of the views and feelings of the whole South, or of the whole North. We would respect the opinions of our brethren every where, but we feel that we shall not be doing justice to ourselves, the Church, or the world, if we do not express independently and in the fear of God, our own sentiments on this important subject. We are not prepared to see the Church of our love and choice, which has been so signally blessed of God, and cherished by the tears, prayers, and untiring efforts of our fathers, lacerated and torn asunder, without one more effort to bind up and heal her bleeding wounds. Therefore,

“Resolved, That we approve of the proposed convention to be holden at Louisville, Ky., May 1st, 1845; and will elect delegates to said convention, according to the ratio agreed upon at the last General Conference by the Southern delegates.

“Resolved, That the Conferences in the non-slaveholding States and Territories, be, and they are hereby respectfully requested to elect one delegate from each Annual Conference, (either in Conference capacity or by the presiding elders,) to meet with one delegate from each of the slaveholding Conferences, in the city of Louisville, Ky., on the first day of May, 1845, to devise some plan of compromise. And, in the event that the non-slaveholding Conferences, or any number of them, which, with the slaveholding Conferences, shall make a respectable majority of all the Annual Conferences, shall so elect delegates,—then, and in that case, the delegates which we will elect from this Conference to the Louisville convention, shall appoint one of their number on said committee of compromise. And the Southern and South-western Conferences are respectfully requested to agree to and act upon this plan.

“Resolved, That if nothing can be effected on the foregoing plan, then the delegates from this Conference are instructed to propose to the Louisville convention the following or some similar plan, as the basis of connection between the two General Conferences—proposed in case of separate organization:—The said General Conferences shall appoint an equal number of delegates, (say ten,) who shall meet together in the interim of the General Conferences, to whom shall be referred for adjustment all matters of difference between the two General Conferences, or those Churches over which they exercise jurisdiction, their decisions or propositions for adjustment to be referred for ultimate action to the General Conferences before mentioned; and when both General Conferences have confirmed their decision, it shall be final and binding on both parties.

“Resolved, That if both the foregoing propositions should fail, then the delegates from this Conference are instructed to support the plan of separation proposed by the late General Conference. And in so doing, we positively disavow secession,

but declare ourselves, by the act of the General Conference, a co-ordinate branch of the Methodist Episcopal Church. And in the event of either the second or third proposition obtaining, the delegates from this Conference are instructed not to favor any—even the least—alteration of our excellent Book of Discipline, except in so far as may be necessary to form a separate organization.

“*Resolved*, That our delegates to the late General Conference merit the warmest expression of our thanks, for their prudent, yet firm course in sustaining the interests of our beloved Methodism in the South.

“*Resolved*, That we warmly commend the truly Christian and impartial course of our Bishops at the late General Conference, and we affectionately invite all our superintendents to attend the convention to be holden at Louisville, Ky.

“All which is respectfully submitted.

“T. K. CATLETT,

“T. SULLINS,

“A. H. MATHES,

“EPIM. E. WILEY,

“DAVID FLEMING,

“C. FULTON,

“R. M. STEVENS,

“JAS. CUMMING,

“O. F. CUNNINGHAM.”

The following report and resolutions, from the Committee on Separation, were adopted by the Tennessee Conference.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON SEPARATION.

“The committee to whom was referred the proposed division of the Methodist Episcopal Church into two separate and distinct General Conference jurisdictions, and kindred subjects, having had the same under mature consideration, beg leave to submit the following:—

“Apprised as we are, that the actions of the late General Conference, together with the entire merits of the proceedings of that body, leading to the contemplated separation of the Church, have been fully and fairly presented to our people, and that both the ministry and membership within our bounds have, with great solicitude and prayerful anxiety, investigated the subject in its various relations, principles, and bearings, we deem it entirely inexpedient at present to enter into detail or to prepare an elaborate investigation of the very important matters committed to us; therefore your committee present the result of their deliberations to the Conference, by the offering for your consideration and adoption the following resolutions:—

“1. *Resolved*, That it is the candid and deliberate judgment

of this Conference, that the action of the late General Conference, by which Bishop Andrew was virtually deposed, as well as their action in confirming the decision of the Baltimore Conference in the case of the Rev. F. A. Harding, is not sustained by the Discipline of our Church, and that we consider such extra-judicial proceeding as constituting a highly dangerous precedent.

"2. That under the great affliction caused by these unfortunate proceedings, we did most ardently hope and pray that the calamitous consequences might have been averted. But since the only plausible plan of reconciliation, the proposition unanimously recommended by our beloved superintendents, was put down by the majority in the late General Conference, we honestly confess we see at present no prospect to avoid a separation.

"3. That we approve the holding a convention of delegates from all the Conferences in the slaveholding States, in the city of Louisville, on the first day of May next, agreeably to the recommendation of the Southern and South-western delegates in the late General Conference; and that the ratio of representation proposed by said delegates—to wit, one delegate for every eleven members of Conference—be, and the same is hereby adopted; and this Conference will elect delegates to the proposed convention upon said basis.

"4. That should a division be found to be indispensable, the delegates of this Conference are required to act under the following instruction—to wit, that the Southern and South-western Conferences shall not be regarded as a secession from the Methodist Episcopal Church, but that they shall be recognised in law, and to all intents and purposes, as a co-ordinate branch of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States of America, simply acting under a separate jurisdiction. And furthermore, as we are well satisfied with the Discipline of our Church as it is, this Conference instruct its delegates not to support or favor any change in said Discipline by said convention; except in so far as may be necessary to conform it in its economical arrangements to the new organization.

"5. That unless we can be well assured that the rights of our ministry and membership can be effectually secured according to Discipline against future aggression, and full reparation be made for past injury, we shall deem the contemplated division unavoidable.

"6. That should the proposed convention, representing the Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the slaveholding States, appointed to assemble in the city of Louisville, the first of May next, proceed to a separate organization, as contingently provided for in the foregoing resolutions, then

and in that event the convention shall be regarded as the regular General Conference, authorized and appointed by the several Annual Conferences of the Southern division of the Church in the United States, and as possessing all the rights and privileges of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States of America, and subject to the same constitutional limitations and restrictions.

"7. That in order to secure the constitutional character and action of the Convention, as a General Conference proper, should a separate organization take place, the ratio of representation, as now found in the second restrictive rule, one for every twenty-one, shall prevail and determine the number of constitutional delegates, taking and accrediting as such the proper number from the Annual Conference first elected in order; and that the supernumerary delegates be regarded as members of the Convention to deliberate, but not members of the General Conference proper, should the convention proceed to a separate organization in the South. *Provided*, nevertheless, that should any delegate or delegates who would not be excluded from the General Conference proper, by the operation of the above regulation, be absent, then any delegate or delegates present, not admitted by said regulation as member or members of the constitutional General Conference, may lawfully take the seat or seats of such absent delegates, upon the principle of selection named above.

"8. That we do most cordially approve the course of our delegates in the late General Conference, in the premises, and that we tender them our sincere thanks for their faithful and independent discharge of duty in a trying crisis.

"9. That the Secretary of this Conference be directed to have the foregoing preamble and resolutions published in the South-western Christian Advocate.

"All which is respectfully submitted.

"F. E. PITTS,
"JOSHUA BOUCHER,
"F. G. FERGUSON,
"G. W. DYE,
"P. P. NEELY,
"W. D. F. SAWRIE,
"JNO. W. HANNER,
"A. F. DRISKILL,
"R. L. ANDREWS."

The following resolutions were adopted by the Conference:—

"*Resolved*, That this Conference invite the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, to attend the convention at Louisville, Ky.

"*Resolved*, That the preacher in charge of each circuit and

station, shall lift a collection before the first day of April next, to defray the expenses of our delegates to the convention at Louisville, Kentucky. The funds so collected shall be handed over to the nearest delegate or forwarded to the Editor of the South-western Christian Advocate, and shall be equally distributed among the delegates in proportion to their expenses; and should any surplus accrue, it shall be returned to the Conference at its next session, and shall be applied as the other Conference funds, in making up the deficiency of our preachers, &c.

On the resolution of the Holston Conference suggesting a plan of compromise, it was unanimously

“Resolved, That sympathizing as we do with our brethren of the Holston Conference in the feeling of deep regret for the necessity of a separation of the Southern portion of our Church from the Northern, and willing as we would be to preserve the union of our beloved Church, upon principles safe and just to ourselves and conservative of the Discipline; yet inasmuch as any proposition for a compromise of existing difficulties, which might be proposed with any probability of success, should come in an authoritative manner from the Northern section of the Church and believing the plan proposed by the Holston Conference, would, if generally adopted by the South, utterly fail to meet the object contemplated, therefore we cannot agree to the proposition.”

The following report and resolutions were submitted to the Memphis Conference, by their Committee on Separation, and was unanimously adopted:—

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON SEPARATION.

“The committee to whom was referred the subject of the division of the Church into two separate General Conference jurisdictions, and all matters connected therewith, after solemnly and prayerfully deliberating upon the same, present the following report. Inasmuch as the Conference is presumed to be well informed on the merits of the subject, we deem it unnecessary to consume time, by entering into an extended and argumentative investigation of the various relations, principles, and bearings of the same, but proceed at once to offer the following resolutions for the action of the Conference.

“Resolved, 1. That it is the deliberate judgment of this Conference, that the action of the late General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, virtually deposing Bishop Andrew, and also their action in affirming the decision of the Baltimore Annual Conference in the case of the Rev. F. A. Harding, are not sustained by the Discipline of our Church, and that we consider these proceedings as constituting a highly dangerous precedent.

"2. That we deeply regret the prospect of division growing out of these proceedings, and do most sincerely and devoutly pray to the great Head of the Church, that some effectual means, not inconsistent with the interests of the cause of Christ, or the honor of all concerned, may be suggested and devised, by which so great a calamity may be averted, and our long cherished union preserved and perpetuated.

"3. That we approve the holding a convention of delegates from the Conferences in the slaveholding States, in the city of Louisville, Kentucky, on the first day of May next, agreeably to the recommendation of the Southern and South-western delegates in the late General Conference; and that the ratio of representation proposed by said delegates, to wit, one delegate for every eleven members of Conference, be, and the same is hereby adopted; and that this Conference will elect delegates to the proposed convention on said basis.

"4. That should a division be found to be indispensable, the delegates of this Conference are hereby required to act under the following instructions, to wit: That the Southern and South-western Conferences shall not be regarded as having by such division *seceded* from the Methodist Episcopal Church; but they shall be recognised in law, and to all intents and purposes, as a co-ordinate branch of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States of America, simply acting under a separate jurisdiction. And further, that being well satisfied with the Discipline of the Church as it now is, this Conference instructs its delegates not to support or favor any change in said Discipline, by said convention, only so far as is necessary to perfect a Southern organization.

"5. That unless we can be assured that the rights of our ministry and membership will be effectually secured, according to Discipline, against future aggressions, and full reparation be made for past injury, we shall deem the contemplated division unavoidable.

"6. That should the proposed convention, representing the Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the slaveholding States, appointed to assemble at the city of Louisville, on the first day of May, 1845, proceed to a separate organization, as contingently provided for in the foregoing resolutions; then, and in that event, the convention shall be regarded as the regular General Conference, authorized and appointed by the several Annual Conferences of the Southern division of the Church, and as possessing all the rights, powers, and privileges of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States of America, and subject to the same restrictions, limitations, and restraints.

"7. That in order to secure the constitutional character and action of the convention, as a General Conference proper, should a separate organization take place, the ratio of representation

as it now stands in the second restrictive rule, one for every twenty-one, shall prevail and determine the constitutional delegates, taking as such, the proper number from each Annual Conference, first elected in order, and that the remaining delegates be regarded as members of the convention to deliberate, but not members of the General Conference proper, should the convention proceed to a separate organization in the South. *Provided*, nevertheless, that should any delegate or delegates who would not be excluded from the General Conference proper, by the operation of the foregoing regulation, be absent, then, any delegate or delegates present, not admitted by said regulation as a member or members of the constitutional General Conference, may lawfully take the seat or seats of such absent delegates upon the principles of selection before named.

“8. That we have witnessed with sorrow and disapprobation, alike the violence manifested by some at the South, and the ultraism displayed by others at the North, and that we regret exceedingly that any Annual Conference should have deemed it necessary to refuse to concur in the recommendation of the late General Conference to alter the sixth restrictive article—nevertheless, we shall entertain for our brethren of the North, the feelings of Christian kindness and brotherly love.

“9. That we heartily approve the entire course pursued by our delegates at the late General Conference.

“10. That we cordially invite such of our Bishops, as may deem it proper, to be present at the contemplated convention in Louisville.

“11. That it be made the duty of each preacher to take up a public collection in every congregation under his charge, for the purpose of defraying the expenses of the delegates to the convention, and that such collections be taken up previous to the first Sabbath in April next, and immediately transmitted to some one of the delegates. And that the delegates be required to report to the next Annual Conference the sums received by them for this purpose, together with the amount expended by them in attending said convention.

“12. That the Secretary of this Conference be instructed to forward the foregoing to the South-western Christian Advocate for publication, with a request that all other Church papers copy.

“MOSES BROCK,
“JOSEPH TRAVIS,
“THOMAS SMITH,
“M. J. BLACKWELL,
“J. T. BASKERVILLE,
“D. J. ALLEN,
“B. H. HUBBARD,
“WILLIAM PEARSON,
“A. T. SCRUGGS.”

The Mississippi Conference adopted the following preamble and resolutions:—

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON DIVISION.

“The committee to whom was referred the subject of the contemplated division of the Methodist Episcopal Church, have endeavored to examine the subject carefully, and in a spirit of reliance upon the teachings of the word of God for direction.

“Your committee can but deplore the existence of such causes as compel the Church of our choice to meditate a severance of that union which has so long existed, and which, under God, has contributed so efficiently to the spread of Scriptural holiness through these lands. But we are fully convinced that justice to ourselves, as well as compassion for the slaves, demand an unqualified disapproval of the action of the late General Conference; first, in confirming the decision of the Baltimore Conference, in the case of Rev. F. A. Harding; and secondly, in virtually suspending Bishop Andrew from the episcopacy, not only without law or usage, but in direct contravention of all law, and in defiance of a resolution adopted by the General Conference of 1840, which provides, ‘that under the provisional exception of the general rule of the Church on the subject of slavery, the simple holding of slaves, or mere ownership of slave property, in the States or Territories where the laws do not admit of emancipation and permit the liberated slave to enjoy freedom, constitutes no legal barrier to the election or ordination of ministers to the various grades of office known in the ministry of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and cannot therefore be considered as operating any forfeiture of right in view of such election and ordination.’

“With the abstract question of slavery we are not now concerned, nor do we regard it as a subject on which the Church has a right to legislate; neither are we disposed in this report to state the full extent of our grievances, or to investigate the reasons which impose upon us the necessity of planning an amicable separation. Your committee deeply regret the injury which may be inflicted upon our beloved Zion by the intemperate and unjust denunciation of the *whole North* by those who have occasion to complain of the illegal and oppressive course pursued by the majority of the late General Conference, and most earnestly recommend the exercise of that charity which ‘suffereth long and is kind.’ As the result of our prayerful examination of the subject in all its bearings, we offer the following resolutions for your consideration and adoption:—

“*Resolved*, 1. That the decision of the late General Conference in the cases of Rev. F. A. Harding and Bishop Andrew,

was unauthorized by the Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and that a tame submission to them upon the part of the Church in the slaveholding States, would prevent our access to the slaves, and expose us to suspicions destructive to our general usefulness.

“Resolved, 2. That as no authorized plan of compromise has been suggested by the North, and as all the propositions made by the Southern delegates were rejected, we regard a separation as inevitable, and approve the holding of a convention, to meet in Louisville, Kentucky, on the first day of May next, agreeably to the recommendation of the Southern and South-western delegates to the late General Conference; and that the ratio of representation proposed by said delegates, to wit: one delegate for every eleven members of the Annual Conferences, be and the same is hereby adopted, and that this Conference will elect delegates to the proposed convention upon said basis. *Provided*, however, that, if in the providence of God, any plan of compromise, which in the judgment of our delegates will redress our grievances and effectually secure to us the full exercise and peaceable enjoyment of all our Disciplinary rights, should be proposed in time to prevent disunion, we will joyfully embrace it.

“Resolved, 3. That our delegates to said convention shall be empowered to co-operate with the delegates to said convention from the other Conferences, in adopting such measures as they shall deem necessary for the complete organization of a Southern Church, provided that it conform in all its essential features to the Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

“Resolved, 4. That the course pursued by our immediate representatives in the late General Conference, was and is approved by us.

“Resolved, 5. That the conciliatory spirit evinced by our general superintendents entitles them to the unqualified approbation of the whole Church, and that we do most cordially invite them to attend the proposed convention.

“All of which is respectfully submitted.

“D. O. SHATTUCK,
“WM. H. WATKINS,
“JNO. G. JONES,
“B. PIPKIN,
“L. CAMPBELL,
“JNO. N. HAMILL,
“A. T. M. FLY,
“DAVID M. WIGGINS,
“W. G. GOULD.

“Eighty-one voting, concurring in the change of the sixth restrictive rule—none non-concurring.

Resolved, That the first Friday in May next be set apart as a day of special fasting and prayer for the superintendence and direction of Divine Providence, with regard to our Church difficulties, that the delegates may act so as to bring the greatest glory to God and the most good to his Church.

"The committee to whom was referred the resolutions of the Holston Conference, have had the same under consideration, and although we hold ourselves in readiness to accept any plan of pacification which obliterates the distinction between Northern and Southern Methodists, we do not regard the resolutions of the Holston Conference as sanctioned by the North, or practicable in itself. Therefore,

Resolved, That this Conference do not concur.

"D. O. SHATTUCK,

"WM. HAMILTON WATKINS,

"JNO. G. JONES,

"B. PIPKIN,

"L. CAMPBELL,

"J. N. HAMILL,

"A. T. M. FLY,

"D. M. WIGGINS,

"WM. G. GOULD.

"Seventy-three non-concurring—none concurring.

The following report and resolutions from the Committee of Seven, were adopted by the Arkansas Conference:—

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON DIVISION.

"The committee to whom was referred the several subjects connected with the prospective division of the Methodist Episcopal Church, have had the same under calm and prayerful consideration, and beg leave to present the following as the result of their honest deliberations.

"Being well convinced that the members of this body have not been inattentive to the proceedings of the late General Conference, and that they have not failed to derive some information from the numerous addresses and communications that have appeared in our periodicals, your committee have not been disposed to waste their time, nor insult your judgments by detailing the many circumstances which, were you differently situated, would require amplification,—they, therefore, present to your minds, for consideration and action, the subjoined resolutions:—

"1. *Resolved*, That it is the decided opinion of this Conference, that the Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church does not sustain the action of the late General Conference in the cases of Rev. F. A. Harding and Bishop Andrew.

"2. *Resolved*, That we approve the suggestions of the

Bishops, as well as the request of several Southern delegates, which contemplated the postponing of the action of the General Conference, until the wishes of the whole Church could be consulted.

"3. *Resolved*, That, as we see no probability that reparation will be made for past injuries, and no security given that the rights and privileges of the ministry and membership in the slaveholding Conferences will be equally respected, we believe it is the imperative duty, if not the only alternative, of the South, to form a separate organization. Nevertheless, should honorable and satisfactory propositions for pacification be made by the North, we shall expect our delegates to favor the perpetuation of the union.

"4. *Resolved*, That we approve the holding of a convention of delegates from the Conferences in the slaveholding States, in the city of Louisville, Kentucky, on the first day of May, 1845, agreeably to the recommendation of the delegates from the Southern and South-western Conferences, in the late General Conference.

"5. *Resolved*, That should the proposed convention, representing the Methodist Episcopal Church in the slaveholding States, appointed to assemble at Louisville, Kentucky, the first day of May, 1845, proceed to a separate organization, as contingently provided for in the foregoing resolutions, then, in that event, the convention shall be regarded as the regular General Conference, authorized and appointed by the several Annual Conferences in the Southern division of the Church, and as possessing all the rights, powers, and privileges of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States of America, and subject to the same restrictions, limitations, and restraints.

"6. *Resolved*, That in order to secure the constitutional character and action of the convention as a General Conference proper, should a separate organization take place, the ratio of representation, as now found in the second restrictive rule, one for every twenty-one, shall prevail and determine the constitutional delegates, taking and accrediting as such the proper number from each Annual Conference, first elected in order; and that the supernumerary delegates be regarded as members of the convention to deliberate, but not members of the General Conference proper, should the convention proceed to a separate organization in the South. *Provided*, nevertheless, that should any delegate or delegates who would not be excluded from the General Conference proper, by the operation of the above regulation, be absent, then any delegate or delegates present, not admitted by said regulation as a member or members of the constitutional General Conference, may

lawfully take the seats of such absent delegates, upon the principle of selection named above.

"7. *Resolved*, That, as we are well satisfied with the Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church as it is, we hereby instruct our delegates to said convention not to favor any change therein.

"8. *Resolved*, That, though we feel ourselves aggrieved, and have been wounded, *without cause*, in the house of our friends, we have no disposition to impute wrong motives to the majority in the late General Conference, and no inclination to endorse those vindictive proceedings had in some portions of the South, believing it to be the duty of Christians, under all circumstances, to exercise that *charity* which *beareth all things*.

"9. *Resolved*, That the preachers take up collections on their several circuits and stations, at an early period, and hand the money collected to their presiding elders, that the delegates may receive the whole amount collected before they shall be required to start for Louisville.

"10. *Resolved*, That we tender our warmest thanks to our representatives in the late General Conference, for the stand which they took, with others, in defence of our Disciplinary rights.

"11. *Resolved*, That the Bishops generally be, and they hereby are requested, if it be congenial with their feelings, to attend the convention at Louisville.

"12. *Resolved*, That we recommend to our people the observance of the first of May next as a day of humiliation and prayer, that the divine presence may attend the deliberations of the convention.

"JOHN HARRELL,

"FOUNTAIN BROWN,

"J. B. ANNIS,

"JACOB CUSTER,

"ALEXANDER AVERY,

"J. F. TRUSLOW."

The Virginia Conference adopted the following preamble and resolutions, as reported by the committee on separation:—

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON SEPARATION.

"The committee, to whom was referred the resolutions of the late General Conference, recommending to all the Annual Conferences at their first approaching sessions, to authorize a change of the sixth Restrictive Article, so that the first clause shall read, 'They shall not appropriate the produce of the Book Concern nor of the Chartered Fund to any purpose, other than the traveling, supernumerary, superannuated, and worn-out Preachers, their wives, widows and children, and to such other purposes as may be determined on by the votes of

two thirds of the members of the General Conference,'—and to whom was also referred the Address of the Southern delegates in the late General Conference, recommending a Southern Convention, to be held in Louisville, Kentucky, on the first day of May, 1845; together with the proceedings of various primary and quarterly conference meetings within the bounds of the Virginia Conference on the subject of a separation from the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, beg leave to report,—

“That having maturely considered these subjects, they do not deem it necessary to present an argument upon the various topics submitted to them; but that the duty assigned them will probably be more satisfactorily accomplished in the following series of resolutions, viz:—

“*Resolved*, 1. That we concur in the recommendation of the late General Conference to change the sixth restrictive article of the Discipline of our Church.

“*Resolved*, 2. That, from the ample sources of information before your committee, in numerous primary meetings, which have been held in various charges within our pastoral limits, and the proceedings of quarterly meeting conferences, which we have the most sufficient reason to regard as a fair and full exponent of the mind and will of the membership upon the subject of the action of the recent General Conference, and the propriety of division,—we are of opinion, that it is the mind of the laity of the Church, with no exception sufficient to be regarded as the basis of action, that, whilst they seriously deprecate division, considered relatively, and most earnestly wish that some ground of permanent union could have been found, they see no alternative, and therefore approve of a peaceable separation in the present circumstances of our condition; and in *this opinion and this determination* your committee unanimously concur.

“*Resolved*, 3. That we concur in the recommendation of the Southern delegates in the late General Conference, that there be a Southern Convention, to be held in Louisville, Kentucky, on the 1st day of May, 1845; and *in the objects of this Convention, as is contemplated in the address of the Southern delegates*.

“*Resolved*, 4. That while we do not propose to dissolve our connection with the Methodist Episcopal Church, but only *with the General Conference* of the Methodist Episcopal Church, we are, therefore, entitled to our full portion of all the rights and privileges appertaining to the property of the Church. Nevertheless, our delegates to the convention to be held in Louisville, Kentucky, in May, 1845, are hereby instructed not to allow the question of property to enter into the calculation whether or not we shall exist as a separate organization.

Resolved, 5. That the action of the late General Conference in the case of Bishop Andrew, was in violation of the provisional rule of the Discipline on the subject of slavery, and in derogation of the dignity and authority of the Episcopal Office: It was, therefore, equally opposed to the rights of the Southern portion of the Church, and of those of the incumbents of the Episcopal Office. But more than this; it was an effort to accomplish, by legislative action, what it was only competent for them to do, *if at all*, by regular judicial process; the very attempt was an acknowledgment that there was no rule of Discipline, under which he could either be deposed or censured—and that the General Conference, being unrestrained by the authority of law, was supreme. Thus, both the Episcopal Office and its incumbents were taken from under the protection of the constitutional restriction, and the provisional rule of Discipline, by which it was made a co-ordinate branch of the government, and placed at the caprice of a majority, which claims that its mere will is the law of the Church.

“Bishop Andrew, therefore, in refusing to resign his office, or otherwise yield to this unwarranted assumption of authority on the part of the General Conference, has taken a noble stand upon the platform of constitutional law, in defence of the Episcopal Office and the rights of the South, which entitles him to the cordial approbation and support of every friend of the Church; and we hereby tender him a unanimous expression of our admiration of his firmness in resisting the misrule of a popular majority.

Resolved, 6. That we cordially approve the course of the Southern and South-western delegates of the late General Conference, in resisting with so much constancy and firmness the encroachments of the majority upon the rights of the South; and for so faithfully warning them against the tendency of those measures, which we fear do inevitably draw after them the dissolution of our ecclesiastical union.

“JOHN EARLEY,

“THOMAS CROWDER, JR.,

“WM. A. SMITH,

“ABRAM PENN,

“GEO. W. NOLLEY,

“ANTHONY DIBRELL,

“H. B. COWLES,

“D. S. DOGGETT,

“JOS. H. DAVIS.

“The recommendation to change the sixth Restrictive Article was concurred in—eighty-one in favor, and none against it, and the whole Report of the committee was unanimously adopted by the Conference.

The North Carolina Conference adopted the following report and resolutions from the Committee on Division:—

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON DIVISION.

“The committee to whom the resolution of the late General Conference, respecting the alteration of the sixth restrictive rule, the report of the select Committee of Nine, on the declaration of the Southern delegates, and the reports of numerous voluntary meetings, both of ministers and people, within the bounds of North Carolina Conference, were referred, beg leave to report:—

“Your committee deeply regret the division of the Methodist Episcopal Church, which the course of the majority in the late General Conference renders not only necessary but inevitable. The unity of the Church, so long the boast and praise of Methodism, was a feature greatly admired, and more than esteemed, by Southern Methodists. For its promotion and preservation they were willing to surrender any thing but principle—vital principle. *This* they could not do!—*this* they dare not do!—The course of the late General Conference demanded a submission on the part of the ministers in the slaveholding Conferences, which the Discipline did not require and the institutions of the South absolutely forbade. To have yielded, therefore, would have opened a breach in Methodism wholly subversive of the Church and greatly mischievous to the civil community—to have yielded would have been ruin. This, therefore, they *refused to do*; absolutely refused! With the Discipline in their hands, sustained and upheld by it, they protested against the proceedings of the majority, with an unfaltering and manly voice, declaring them to be not only unauthorized but unconstitutional. The protestation, however, just and legal as it was, authorized and borne out by the Discipline, was altogether unavailing. Nothing was left for the South to do, but to pass from under the jurisdiction of so wayward a power, to the regulations and government of our old, wholesome, and Scriptural Discipline. This, we sorrow when we say it, has opened a great gulf—we fear an impassable gulf—between the North and the South. This consolation, however, if no other, they have—the good Book of Discipline, containing the distinctive features of the Methodist Episcopal Church, shall still lie on the South side. Compelled by circumstances which could neither be alleviated nor controlled—which neither the entreaties of kindness nor the force of truth could successfully resist, we hesitate not to decide on being forever separate from those whom we not only esteem but love. Better far that we should suffer the loss of union, than that thousands, yea millions of souls should perish.

“From the reports of quarterly meeting conferences and

numerous voluntary meetings within the bounds of the North Carolina Conference, both of ministers and people, we feel assured that it is the mind of our people and preachers fully to sustain the action of the Southern and South-western delegates, as set forth in the Declaration and Protest: and therefore,

"1. *Resolved*, That the time has come for the ministers of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the slaveholding States, to refuse to act in union with the North.

"2. *Resolved*, That we concur in the proposed alteration of the sixth Restrictive Rule of the Discipline.

"3. *Resolved*, That we concur in the recommendation to hold a Convention in Louisville, Kentucky, in May, 1845.

"4. *Resolved*, That this Conference elect delegates to said Convention according to the basis of representation recommended.

"5. *Resolved*, That the action of the late General Conference, in the case of Bishop Andrew, was a violation of the rule of Discipline on the subject of slavery, and derogatory to the dignity of the Episcopal Office, by throwing it from under the protection of law, and exposing it to the reproach and obloquy of misrule and lawless power. The Bishop, therefore, acted justly and honorably in resisting such action and declining obedience to the resolution of said Conference; and for thus guarding and respecting the rights of the South, both of ministers and people, he is entitled to our highest regards.

"All which is respectfully submitted.

"H. G. LEIGH,

"S. S. BRYANT,

"JAS. JAMESON,

"P. DOUB,

"BENNET T. BLAKE,

"JAMES REID,

"D. B. NICHOLSON,

"R. J. CARSON,

"WM. CARTER.

"The above report was *unanimously* adopted by the Conference. On the question of concurrence in altering the sixth Restrictive Rule, the vote was ayes 58—nays none.

"S. S. BRYANT,

"*Sec'y. of N. C. An. Conf.*"

The following preamble and resolutions were adopted by the South Carolina Conference, relative to the subject of separation:—

THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON SEPARATION.

"The committee to whom was referred the general subject of the difficulties growing out of the action of the late General Conference on the cases of Bishop Andrew and brother Hard-

ing; and, in particular, the report of the select committee on the Declaration of the Southern and South-western delegates of the General Conference, as adopted by the Conference; and the proceedings of numerous quarterly conferences, and other meetings, in all parts of our Annual Conference district; respectfully offer the following Report:—

“It appears to your committee, on the evidence of numerous documents, and the testimony of the preachers, in open Conference, that in all the circuits and stations of this Conference district, the people have expressed their minds with respect to the action of the General Conference, and the measures proper to be adopted in consequence of that action. Resolutions to that effect have been adopted by the quarterly conferences of all the circuits and stations, without any exception; and in many, perhaps in most of them, by other meetings also, which have been called expressly for the purpose; and in some of them, by meetings held at every preaching-place where there was a society. And on all these occasions, there has been but one voice uttered—one opinion expressed—from the sea-board to the mountains, as to the unconstitutionality and injurious character of the action in the cases above named; the necessity which that action imposes for a separation of the Southern from the Northern Conferences, and the expediency and propriety of holding a convention at Louisville, Kentucky, and of your sending delegates to it, agreeably to the proposition of the Southern and South-western delegates of the late General Conference.

“Your committee, also, have made diligent inquiry both out of Conference and by calling openly in Conference for information from the preachers, as to the number, if any, of local preachers, or other official members, or members of some standing among us, who should have expressed, in the meetings or in private, a different opinion from that which the meetings have proclaimed. And the result of this inquiry has been, that, in the whole field of our Conference district, one individual only has been heard to express himself doubtfully, as to the expediency of a separate jurisdiction for the Southern and South-western Conferences; not even one as to the character of the General Conference action. Nor does it appear that this unanimity of the people has been brought about by popular harangues, or any schismatic efforts of any of the preachers, or other influential persons; but that it has been as spontaneous as universal, and from the time that the final action of the General Conference became known, at every place. Your committee state this fact thus formally, that it may correct certain libelous imputations which have been cast on some of our senior ministers, in the Christian Advocate and

Journal; as well as for the evidence which it furnishes of the necessity of the measures which are in progress for the relief of the Church in the South and South-west.

“Your committee also consider it due to state, that it does not appear that the action of the General Conference in the cases of the Bishop and of brother Harding, proceeded of ill-will, as of purpose to oppress us; nor of any intended disregard of the authority of the Scriptures or of the Discipline, as if to effect the designs of a politico-religious faction, without warrant of the Scriptures, and against the Discipline and the peace of the Church. But they consider that action as having been produced out of causes which had their origin in the fanatical abolitionism of Garrison and others; and which, being suffered to enter and agitate the Church, first in New England and afterwards generally at the North, worked up such a revival of the anti-slavery spirit as had grown too strong for the restraints of either Scripture or Discipline, and too general through the Eastern, Northern, and North-western Conferences to be resisted any longer by the easy, good-natured prudence of the brethren representing those Conferences in the late General Conference. Pressed beyond their strength, whether little or much, they had to give way; and reduced, (by the force of principles which, whether by their own fault or not, had obtained a controlling power,) to the alternative of breaking up the Churches of their own Conference districts, or adopting measures which they might hardly persuade themselves could be endured by the South and South-west, they determined on the latter. The best of men may have their judgments perverted; and it is not wonderful that under such stress of circumstances, the majority should have adopted a new construction of both Scripture and Discipline, and persuaded themselves that in pacifying the abolitionists, they were not unjust to their Southern brethren. Such, however, is unquestionably the character of the measures they adopted; and which the Southern Churches cannot possibly submit to, unless the majority who enacted them could also have brought us to a conviction that we ought to be bound by their judgment, against our consciences and calling of God, and the warrant of Scripture, and the provisions of the Discipline. But while we believe that our paramount duty in our calling of God, positively forbids our yielding the Gospel in the Southern States, to the pacification of abolitionism in the Northern, and the conviction is strong and clear in our own minds that we have both the warrant of Scripture and the plain provisions of the Discipline to sustain us, we see no room to entertain any proposition for compromise, under the late action in the cases of Bishop Andrew and brother Harding,

and the principles avowed for the maintenance of that action, short of what has been shadowed forth in the Report of the select committee which we have had under consideration, and the measures recommended by the Southern and South-western delegates at their meeting after the General Conference had closed its session.

“Your committee do, therefore, recommend the adoption of the following resolutions:—

“1. *Resolved*, That it is necessary for the Annual Conferences in the slaveholding States and Territories, and in Texas, to unite in a distinct ecclesiastical connection, agreeably to the provisions of the Report of the Select Committee of Nine of the late General Conference, adopted on the 8th day of June last.

“2. *Resolved*, That we consider and esteem the adoption of the Report of the aforesaid committee of Nine, by the General Conference, (and the more for the unanimity with which it was adopted) as involving the most solemn pledge which could have been given by the majority to the minority and the Churches represented by them, for the full and faithful execution of all the particulars specified and intended in that Report.

“3. *Resolved*, That we approve of the recommendation of the Southern delegates, to hold a convention in Louisville, on the 1st day of May next, and will elect delegates to the same on the ratio recommended in the address of the delegates to their constituents.

“4. *Resolved*, That we earnestly request the Bishops, one and all, to attend the said convention.

“5. *Resolved*, That while we do not consider the proposed convention competent to make any change or changes in the rules of discipline, they may nevertheless indicate what changes, if any, are deemed necessary under a separate jurisdiction of the Southern and South-western Conferences. And that *it is necessary* for the convention to resolve on, and provide for, a separate organization of these Conferences under a General Conference to be constituted and empowered in all respects *for the government of these Conferences*, as the General Conference hitherto has been with respect to *all* the Annual Conferences—according to the provisions and intention of the late General Conference.

“6. *Resolved*, That as, in common with all our brethren of this Conference district, we have deeply sympathized with Bishop Andrew in his afflictions, and believe him to have been blameless in the matter for which he has suffered, so, with them, we affectionately assure him of our approbation of his course, and receive him as not the less worthy, or less to be

honored in his Episcopal character, for the action which has been had in his case.

"7. *Resolved*, That we recognize in the wisdom and prudence, the firmness and discretion, exhibited in the course of Bishop Soule, during the General Conference—as well as in former instances wherein he has proved his devotion to the great principles of constitutional right in our Church,—nothing more than was to be expected from the bosom friend of Asbury and McKendree.

"8. *Resolved*, That in common with the whole body of our people, we approve of the conduct of our delegates, both during the General Conference, and subsequently.

"9. *Resolved*, That we concur in the recommendation of the late General Conference for the change of the Sixth Article of the Restrictive Rules in the book of Discipline, so as to allow an equitable pro-rata division of the Book Concern.

"W. CAPERS,	} <i>Committee."</i>
"W. SMITH,	
"H. BASS,	
"N. TALLEY,	
"H. A. C. WALKER,	
"C. BETTS,	
"S. W. CAPERS,	
"S. DUNWOODY,	
"R. J. BOYD.	

The Indian Mission Conference adopted the following resolutions relative to division:—

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON SEPARATION.

"The committee to whom was referred the action of the late General Conference relating to an amicable division of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States, beg leave to report the following resolutions for adoption by the Conference:

"1. *Resolved*, That we concur in the proposed alteration of the sixth Restrictive Article of the Discipline.

"2. *Resolved*, That we approve the course pursued by the minority of the late General Conference.

"3. *Resolved*, That we elect delegates to represent the Indian Mission Conference in the contemplated convention to be held in Louisville, Kentucky, in May next.

"4. *Resolved*, That this Conference do deeply deplore the necessity for division of any kind in the Methodist Episcopal Church; and that we will not cease to send up our prayers to Almighty God for his gracious interposition, and that he may guide the affairs of the Church to a happy issue.

"J. C. BERRYMAN, *Ch'n.*

“The above report having been read, was taken up section by section, and disposed of as follows: The first resolution was adopted, ayes 14; nays 1. The second resolution was adopted, ayes 11; nays 3; declined voting, 4. The third resolution was adopted, ayes 17. The fourth resolution was adopted, ayes 17. The preamble and resolutions were then adopted by the Conference as a whole.

“The Conference then proceeded, in accordance with the third resolution, to elect delegates to attend the proposed convention in Louisville, in May next. On counting the votes, it appeared that the whole number of votes given was twenty-one, of which number William H. Goode had received twenty, Edward T. Peery eighteen, scattering four. Whereupon, W. H. Goode and E. T. Peery having received a majority of all the votes given, were declared duly elected. D. B. Cumming was then elected reserve delegate.

“The following resolutions were on the next day unaimously adopted at the request of the delegates elect.

“*Resolved*, That in view of the condition of the Church at the present trying crisis, the members of this Conference will, when practicable, as near as may be, at the hour of twilight, in the evening of each day, until the close of the approaching convention at Louisville, meet each other at a throne of grace, and devoutly implore the blessing of God upon our assembled delegates in the discharge of their important duties.

“*Resolved*, That the Friday preceding the opening of said convention, be set apart as a day of fasting and supplication to Almighty God for the continued unity, peace, and prosperity of the Methodist Episcopal Church; and that our members throughout this Conference be requested to join us in the devotions of that day.

“WM. H. GOODE,

“E. T. PEERY.”

The following preamble and resolutions were unanimously adopted by the Georgia Conference:—

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON DIVISION.

“The committee appointed to take into consideration the difficulties of the Church as growing out of the action of the General Conference in the case of Bishop Andrew, and to submit some recommendations to the Annual Conference for their adoption, beg leave to report:—

“The action of the majority in the last General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, in the cases of Bishop Andrew and the Rev. Mr. Harding, has rendered it *indispensable* that the Conferences, within whose limits slavery exists, should cease to be under the jurisdiction of that body. They must either abandon the people collected under their ministry, and

committed to their pastoral care, and the vast and widening field of missionary labor among the slaves—a field to which their attention is imperatively called by their sympathies as Christians, their sense of ministerial obligation as preachers of the gospel, and their interests and duties as citizens—or they must live under the control of an ecclesiastical body, separate and distinct from, and independent of the Conferences lying within the States and Territories where slavery is not allowed by law. In view of the relations before stated, that distinct organization is required by a *necessity* strict and *absolute*, and upon that issue we place it, before the Church and the world. The exigence which brings it upon us, arose not out of our acts, or designs; no collateral considerations of expedience abated our zeal in withstanding it; no collateral issues upon points involved, affected our determination to maintain the unity of the Church under one organization as heretofore existing; no pride of opinion, speculative differences, nor personal motives have conducted us to this conclusion. We did not seek to effect any changes in the doctrine or Discipline of our Church; we did not ask any boon at the hands of the General Conference, nor any exemption from the operation of the laws which were common to the whole connection; and whatever consequences affecting the Church, or the civil community, may result from our movement, we confidently look for acquittal to the judgment of posterity, and the decision of the sober and unprejudiced among our cotemporaries. The General Conference violated the law of the Church, first, by confirming the decision of the Baltimore Conference, suspending the Rev. Mr. Harding from his connection with that Conference as a traveling preacher therein, because he would not give freedom to slaves, which by the laws of the land he could not manumit; and secondly, by passing a resolution intended to inhibit Bishop Andrew from the exercise of his Episcopal functions for the same reasons; in both cases contrary to the express provisions of the Discipline, which allow preachers to hold slaves wherever they are not permitted by the laws of the land to enjoy freedom when manumitted, and in both cases striking an effective blow at the fundamental principle of the economy of Methodism, as it destroys that general itinerancy of the preachers which is its most distinguished peculiarity; for under their decision, preachers holding slaves in Conferences, where by the law of the Discipline they are allowed so to do, may not be transferred to Conferences, whithin whose limits slavery does not exist. By the same decision, both preachers and lay members holding slaves, are thrown into an odious and dishonored caste, the first deprived of office therefor, and the re-

ligious character of both impeached, and thrown under suspicion thereby; to which must be added, as an evil not lightly to be regarded, nor slightly overlooked, that in connection with the fanatical movements of abolitionists in the North, East, and West, it is well fitted to excite slaves to disaffection and rebellion, making it imperative upon governments and citizens to prohibit all communication between slaves and preachers, who either teach such doctrine, or impliedly admit it to be true by submitting to such dishonor and deprivation. Secondly. That in the case of Bishop Andrew the General Conference have violated the Discipline of the Church and invaded personal rights, which are secured by the laws of every enlightened nation, if not by the usages of every savage people on earth. They tried, and sentenced Bishop Andrew without charges preferred, or a cognizable offence stated. If it is even admitted that they intended to charge him with 'improper conduct,' as a phrase used in the Discipline to embrace every class of offences for which a Bishop is amenable to the General Conference, and on conviction liable to be expelled, they did not *formally* prefer that charge; if they intended to specify his 'connection with slavery,' as the substantive offence under that charge, a 'connection with slavery' is not a cognizable offence, under any law of our Church, written or unwritten, statutory or prescriptive, and the only 'connection with slavery' attempted to be established in his case, is expressly permitted by the Discipline in section 10th, part 2nd, on slavery. If they claimed the right to declare in their legislative capacity, that 'such a connection with slavery' was an offence in a Bishop, they could only extend it to him *retroactively by ex post facto enactment*, and even then it was never *promulgated* until the very moment in which they pronounced his sentence by a majority vote. But we cannot admit that the framers of our Discipline ever intended to subject a Bishop to the monstrous injustice of being liable to be *expelled* by the General Conference, exercising original jurisdiction, for an *impropriety* short of immorality, or official delinquency, whilst they so cautiously secured his official and personal rights in all cases where that body has appellate cognizance of charges for positive immoralities; and we are confident that a fair and rational construction of the 4th and 5th questions and their answers in the 4th section of the 1st chapter of the Discipline, will make 'improper conduct,' in the answer to the 4th question, and 'immorality,' in the 5th, descriptive of the same class of offences in the mind of the law-maker, who could never have intended to subject that venerable officer to expulsion, for offences so light, that they could not be considered either immoralities or official delinquencies, and so

entirely dependent for their very existence upon the caprice or varying notions of every General Conference, that they could not either be classified or designated.

"The foregoing views we consider the embodiment of public opinion throughout our Conference. The sentiments of our people in primary meetings, in quarterly conferences, as expressed in the most solemn forms, sustain the course of our delegation in the General Conference, and approve and even demand an organization which shall transfer the slaveholding Conferences from the jurisdiction of the North. The unanimity of the people we verily believe to be without a parallel in the history of Church action, and therefore feel ourselves perfectly justified in recommending to your body the adoption of the following resolutions, viz:—

"1. *Resolved*, That we will elect delegates to the Convention to be held in Louisville, in Kentucky, on the 1st of May next, upon the basis of representation proposed and acted on by the other Conferences; viz, one delegate for every eleven members of our Conference.

"2. *Resolved*, That our delegates be instructed to co-operate with the delegates from the other Southern and South-western Conferences, who shall be represented in the Convention, in effecting the organization of a General Conference, which shall embrace those Annual Conferences, and in making all necessary arrangements for its going into operation, as soon as the acts of the said Convention shall have been reported by the several delegations to their constituents, and accepted by them, according to such arrangements as may be made by the Convention for carrying the same into effect.

"3. *Resolved*, That our delegates be instructed to use all prudent precautions to secure that portion of the Book Concern and Chartered Fund, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, to which the Annual Conferences represented in the convention, shall be unitedly entitled, and all the property to which the several Annual Conferences are entitled, to them severally, and that to this end, they be requested to obtain the written opinions of one or more eminent Lawyers; but that in the event they must either abandon the property, or remain under the jurisdiction of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, constituted as it now is, they be left to the exercise of a sound discretion in the premises.

"4. *Resolved*, That our delegates make a report to this body at its next session, of all their acts and doings in the aforesaid Convention, and this body shall not be bound by any arrangements therein made, until after it shall have accepted and approved them in Conference assembled.

"5. *Resolved*, That our delegates be, and they are hereby

instructed not to agree to any alterations in the Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church, but that the Discipline adopted under the new organization, shall be that known and recognized as the Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States, with such modifications only as are necessary formally to adapt it to the new organization.

"6. *Resolved*, That we consider ourselves as an integral part of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States, and that we have done no act, nor do we authorize any act to be done in our name, by which our title to be so considered shall be forfeited, unless in the event contemplated in the last clause of the third Resolution it becomes necessary so to do.

"7. *Resolved*, That we highly appreciate the devotion of our venerable senior Bishop to the constitution and discipline of the Church, and his uncompromising firmness in maintaining both the one and the other, and hereby assure him of our increased confidence and affection.

"8. *Resolved*, That our beloved Bishop Andrew has endeared himself to the preachers and people of the Southern Church, by resisting the constitutional dictation of the majority of the late General Conference, and that we cordially approve his whole action in the case and welcome him to the unrestricted exercise of his episcopal functions among us.

"9. *Resolved*, That the course of our delegates in the trying circumstances by which they were surrounded during the last session of the General Conference, meets our entire approbation.

"10. *Resolved*, That we concur in the alteration of the sixth Restrictive Rule, as recommended by the Resolution of the General Conference.

"11. *Resolved*, That we do not concur with the Holston Conference in the resolution proposed by them, regarding it as tending only to embarrass the action of the convention, without the slightest promise of good to either division of the Church.

" L. PIERCE,

" THOMAS SAMFORD,

" IGNATIUS A. FEW,

" SAMUEL ANTHONY,

" ISAAC BORING,

" GEO. F. PIERCE,

" JOAN W. TALLEY,

" W. D. MATTHEWS,

" J. B. PAYNE,

" JOSIAH LEWIS.

"It was further resolved, that the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church be requested to attend the convention of Southern delegates to be held at Louisville in May next."

The following Report of the Committee of Nine was unanimously adopted by the Florida Conference:—

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON SEPARATION.

“The committee to whom was referred the subject of the action of the late General Conference in the cases of Bishop Andrew and F. A. Harding; also the report of the Committee of Nine in the late General Conference on the subject of a peaceable separation of the Church; also the resolution of the Holston Conference on the same subject, submit the following resolutions, to wit:—

“1. *Resolved*, That we disapprove of the course of the late General Conference in the cases of Bishop Andrew and F. A. Harding.

“2. That we heartily approve the proposed plan of separation as adopted by the General Conference, under which the Southern and South-western Conferences are authorized to unite in a distinct ecclesiastical connexion.

“3. That we are satisfied that the peace and success of the Church in the South demand a separate and distinct organization.

“4. That we commend and admire the firm and manly course pursued by Bishop Andrew under the trials he has had to encounter, and that we still regard him as possessing all his Episcopal functions.

“5. That the course pursued by our venerable senior superintendent, Bishop Soule, in defending the Discipline of our Church, has served but to endear him to us more and more, and we heartily approve his course in inviting Bishop Andrew to assist him in his Episcopal visitations.

“6. That we tender our warmest thanks to all those brethren who voted in the minority in Bishop Andrew’s case.

“7. That we approve of the proposed convention to be held in Louisville the first of May next, and will proceed to elect delegates to said convention.

“8. That *we do not* concur in the resolutions of the Holston Conference, proposing the election of Delegates for forming a plan of compromise.

“9. That *we do* concur in the recommendation of the late General Conference for the change of the sixth article in the restrictive rules in the Book of Discipline, allowing an equitable *pro rata* division of the Book Concern.

“P. P. SMITH,

“T. C. BENNING,

“R. H. LUCKEY,

“J. W. YARBROUGH,

“R. H. HOWREN,

“W. W. GRIFFIN,

“A. PEELER,

“A. MARTIN,

“S. P. RICHARDSON.”

The Texas Conference adopted the following report and resolutions, presented by the Committee on Separation:—

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON SEPARATION.

“The committee to whom were referred certain acts of the late General Conference, causing and providing for a division of the Methodist Episcopal Church, or the General Conference thereof, and sundry communications pertaining thereto, have had the same under solemn and prayerful consideration, and beg leave to present the following report:—

“In view of the numerous expositions and arguments, *pro* and *con*, with which the Christian Advocates have teemed for some months, on the merits of the highly important subject upon which your committee have been called to act, they presume that the Conference is too well enlightened to need an elaborate and argumentative investigation of them, in their multifarious relations and bearings; they therefore respectfully present the following resolutions, as the result of their deliberations:—

“*Resolved*, 1. That we approve of the course of the Southern and South-western delegates in the late General Conference; and that their independent and faithful discharge of duty, in a trying crisis, commands our admiration and merits our thanks.

“2. That we deeply deplore the increasingly fearful controversy between the Northern and Southern divisions of the Methodist Episcopal Church on the institution of domestic slavery, and that we will not cease to pray most fervently to the great Head of the Church for his gracious interposition in guiding this controversy to a happy issue.

“3. That we approve the appointment of a convention of delegates from the Conferences in the slaveholding States, in the city of Louisville, on the first of May next, by the Southern and South-western delegates in the late General Conference; and also the ratio of representation proposed by said delegates, to wit, one delegate for every eleven members of the Conference, and that we will elect delegates to the proposed convention upon said basis, to act under the following instructions, to wit: To endeavor to secure a compromise between the North and South—to oppose a formal division of the Church before the General Conference of 1848, or a general convention can be convened to decide the present controversy. But should a division be deemed unavoidable, and be determined on by the convention, then, being well satisfied with the Discipline of the Church, as it is, we instruct our delegates not to support or favor any change in said Discipline, by said convention, other than to adapt its fiscal economy to the Southern organization.

“4. That we approve of the dignified and prudent course of the bench of Bishops, who presided in the late General Conference.

"5. That it is the sense of this Conference, that the Rev. John Clarke, one of our delegates to the late General Conference, entirely misrepresented our views and sentiments in his votes, in the cases of Rev. F. A. Harding and Bishop Andrew.

"6. That we appoint the Friday immediately preceding the meeting of the proposed general convention of the delegates of the Southern and South-western Conferences, as a day of fasting and prayer for the blessing of Almighty God on said convention—that it may be favored with the healthful influence of his grace, and the guidance of his wisdom.

"CHAUNCEY RICHARDSON,

"ROBERT ALEXANDER,

"SAMUEL A. WILLIAMS."

The Alabama Conference adopted the following preamble and resolutions in relation to separation:—

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON DIVISION.

"The committee appointed by the Conference to take into consideration the subject of a separate jurisdiction for the Southern Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, beg leave to report, That they have meditated with prayerful solicitude on this important matter, and have solemnly concluded on the necessity of the measure. They suppose it to be superfluous to review formally all the proceedings which constitute the unhappy controversy between the Northern and Southern portions of our Church, inasmuch as their sentiments can be expressed in one sentence,—They endorse the unanswerable Protest of the Minority in the late General Conference. They believe that the doctrines of that imperishable document cannot be successfully assailed. They are firm in the conviction that the action of the majority in the case of Bishop Andrew was unconstitutional. Being but a delegated body, the General Conference has no legitimate right to tamper with the office of a General Superintendent—his amenableness to that body and liability to expulsion by it, having exclusive reference to mal-administration, ceasing to travel, and immoral conduct. They are of opinion that Bishop Andrew's connection with slavery can come under none of these heads.—If the entire eldership of the Church, in a conventional capacity, were to constitute non-slaveholding or even abolitionism a tenure by which the Episcopal office should be held, or if they were to abolish the office, they doubtless could plead the abstract right thus to modify or revolutionize the Church in its supreme executive administration. But before the General Conference can justly plead this right, it must show when and where such plenary power was delegated to it by the *only fountain of authority, the entire Pastorate of the Church.*

Your committee are therefore of opinion, that the General Conference has no more power over a Bishop, except in the specified cases of mal-administration, ceasing to travel, and immorality, than over the Episcopacy, as an integral part of our ecclesiastical polity. It can no more depose a Bishop for slaveholding than it can create a new Church.

“Your committee deeply regret that these ‘conservative’ sentiments did not occur to the majority in the late General Conference, and that the apologists of that body, since its session, have given them no place in their ecclesiastical creed, but on the contrary have given fearful evidence that the proceedings in the case of Bishop Andrew are but the incipency of a course, which when finished, will leave not a solitary slaveholder in the communion which shall be unfortunately under their control. The foregoing sentiments and opinions embody the general views expressed most unequivocally throughout the Conference district since the late General Conference, by the large body of the membership, both in *primary meetings* and quarterly conferences.

“The committee, therefore, offer to the calm consideration and mature action of the Alabama Annual Conference, the following series of resolutions:—

“1. *Resolved*, That this Conference deeply deplores the action of the late General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the case of our venerable Superintendent, Bishop Andrew, believing it to be unconstitutional, being as totally destitute of warrant from the Discipline as from the Word of God.

“2. That the almost unanimous agreement of Northern Methodists with the majority, and Southern Methodists with the minority of the late General Conference, shows the wisdom of that body in suggesting a duality of jurisdiction to meet the present emergency.

“3. That this Conference agrees to the proposition for the alteration of the sixth Restrictive Rule of the Discipline.

“4. That this Conference approves of the projected convention at Louisville in May next.

“5. That this Conference most respectfully invites all the Bishops to attend the proposed convention at Louisville.

“6. That this Conference is decided in its attachment to Methodism as it exists in the Book of Discipline, and hopes that the Louisville Convention will not make the slightest alteration, except so far as may be absolutely necessary for the formation of a separate jurisdiction.

“7. That every preacher of this Conference shall take up a collection in his station or circuit, as soon as practicable, to defray the expenses of the delegates to the Convention, and

the proceeds of such collection shall be immediately paid over to the nearest delegate or Presiding Elder; and the excess, or deficit of the collection for the said expenses shall be reported to the next Conference, which shall take action on the same.

"8. That the Friday immediately preceding the session of the convention, shall be observed in all our circuits and stations, as a day of fasting and prayer for the blessings of God upon its deliberations.

"9. That whilst this Conference fully appreciates the commendable motives which induced the Holston Conference to suggest another expedient to compromise the differences existing between the Northern and Southern divisions of the Church, it nevertheless cannot concur in the proposition of that Conference concerning that matter.

"10. That this Conference fully recognizes the right of our excellent superintendent, Bishop Soule, to invite Bishop Andrew to share with him the responsibilities of the episcopal office, and while the Conference regrets the absence of the *former*, it rejoices in being favored with the efficient services of the *latter*—it respectfully tenders these 'true yokefellows' in the superintendency the fullest approbation, the most fervent prayers, and the most cordial sympathies.

"THOS. O. SUMMERS,

"A. H. MITCHELL,

"E. V. LEVERT,

"J. HAMILTON,

"E. HEARN,

"W. MURRAH,

"J. BORING,

"GEO. SHAEFFER,

"C. McLEOD."

Such was the action of the different Annual Conferences in the slaveholding States, with regard to the proceedings of the General Conference, on the subject of slavery. From these it will be perceived that great unanimity prevailed in disapproving the proscription of Bishop Andrew, and in the opinion that the General Conference action had imposed on the South the necessity of falling upon the plan of separation as a measure of peace and self-defence. It is from these official proceedings that the real opinions and temper of the South are to be gathered, and not from some unguarded expression, or ebullition of transient feeling, on the part of individuals. If this latter rule were to govern the case, the North would fall under heavy condemnation, at least equally with the South; for there the truth and honor of the whole Southern ministry have been impeached, and the utmost uncharitableness been manifested in the language of those appointed to speak the

sentiments of that portion of the Church. In the official action of the Southern Conferences a commendable moderation generally prevails, and even in those in the extreme South we find them seeking motives the most charitable to which the action of their Northern brethren might be ascribed.

But we must now go back and briefly notice another branch of this history.

We have seen in the former part of this work, that while the General Conference declared it their "sense" that Bishop Andrew should cease to exercise Episcopal functions, while encumbered with slavery, they declared him still a Bishop of the Church,—that he should be so published in the Discipline, Hymn Book, &c., and should be so supported; but that his taking or not taking Episcopal labor, should depend on his own decision with reference to the previous action of that body. In this state of things the plan of Episcopal visitation was made out for the succeeding four years, and published, without embracing the name of Bishop Andrew,—he having left the seat of the Conference before its final adjournment.

The fact was this, the board of Bishops agreed that Bishop Andrew should be taken into the plan of Episcopal visitation, provided he should apply for work, and to meet that contingency they prepared a second plan of visitation including Bishop Andrew, which plan was to be published in place of the first, in case he made such application. This *reserved plan* was committed to the hands of Bishop Soule, to be published if Bishop Andrew should make application, in writing, for Episcopal work. But of all this arrangement Bishop Andrew had no notice whatever, except in vague rumor. In this condition matters remained for some months. For a time the general current of opinion among the Bishop's friends seemed to be against his performing any Episcopal labor; for it was more than intimated that if he did so, he would be impeached for a violation of the expressed will or "sense" of the General Conference. When, however, it appeared to be settled that the Bishop would not take work, there were not wanting among those who favored his suspension, men who urged the propriety and even duty of his performing Episcopal labor. The measure was urged in one or more of the Northern Church papers, and in a more private way, it was said that as the Bishop was supported by the Church, he had no right to withhold his labors, and it was strongly suggested that such neglect of official duty might very properly constitute just ground of impeachment.

At this crisis, Bishop Andrew received a letter from Bishop Soule, inviting him into the field. The letter and response are given below, and they sufficiently explain themselves. This was the first authentic information Bishop Andrew received of

the arrangement entered into by the Bishops at the close of the General Conference.

“CHARLESTON, S. C., Nov. 4, 1844.

“MY DEAR BROTHER,—I perceive from the resolutions passed at the various Church meetings in the South, that there is a very general expression of opinion in favor of my taking my appropriate share of Episcopal labor; and as I have received, both from public meetings and individual correspondents, from ministers and laymen, the most earnest and affectionate invitations to attend the sessions of most of the Southern and South-western Conferences, I deem it due to all concerned to state definitely the course I have pursued, and had resolved to pursue, till the meeting of the convention at Louisville, Kentucky. Immediately after the passing of the memorable resolution in my case in the late General Conference, I left the city of New York and spent the next day, which was the Sabbath, at Newark, New Jersey, to fulfill an engagement previously made; after which I returned to the bosom of my family in Georgia. From Newark I addressed a letter to Bishop Soule, assigning the reasons for my departure, and stating in substance to the following effect, viz.: That I did not know whether the Bishops would feel authorized, in view of the recent action of the General Conference, to assign me a place among them for the next four years, unless that body should condescend to explain its action more definitely; but that if the Bishops should see proper to assign me my share in the Episcopal visitations, I should be glad that they would let my work commence as late in the season as convenient, inasmuch as I had been absent from my family most of the time for the last twelve months; but that if they did not feel authorized, in view of the action of the General Conference, to give me work, I should not feel hurt with them. It will be remembered that there was subsequently introduced into the Conference a resolution intended to explain the meaning of the former one as being simply *advisory*; this was promptly laid on the table, which left no doubt of the correctness of the opinion I had previously formed, that the General Conference designed the action as *mandatory*. I understand that the Southern delegates afterwards notified the Bishops in due form, that if they should give me my portion of the Episcopal work, I would attend to it. The plan of Episcopal visitation, however, was drawn up and subsequently published without my name, as is well known. I have heard it rumored, indeed, that this plan was so arranged that I could be taken into it at *any time* when I should signify a wish to be so introduced; and some anonymous correspondents of the Western and South-western Christian Advocates have expressed themselves in a

manner which indicated some surprise that I had not availed myself of this kind provision of the Episcopal Board. Now, in reply to all this I have only to say, that I presume those gentlemen are mistaken entirely as to the practicability of any such arrangement; for if the Bishops had contemplated the possibility of any such change in their plan, it is but fair to infer that either they would have appended to their published arrangement some note to that effect, or else that they would have informed me of it by letter; and forasmuch as they have done neither, I presume that the aforementioned rumor is altogether without foundation. However, I may be mistaken in this judgment, as I know nothing of the plans of the Bishops, other than what is published, not having received a line from one of them since the General Conference, save the accompanying letter from Bishop Soule. In view of all these facts, I came deliberately to the conclusion that the Bishops thought it most prudent, under the circumstances, not to invite me to perform any official action; and as I wished to be the cause of no unpleasant feeling to the Bishops or preachers, I determined not to visit any of the Annual Conferences at their respective sessions. At the urgent solicitation, however, of many of the preachers of the Kentucky Conference, I so far changed my determination as to make an effort to reach that Conference about the last day or two of the session; but a very unexpected detention on the road prevented the accomplishment of my purpose. Further reflection brought me back to my original purpose; and I abstained from visiting Holston and Missouri. On the important questions which now agitate us; I wished the Conferences to act in view of the great facts and principles involved, apart from any influence which my personal presence among them might produce. I had laid out my plan of work for the winter: I designed to visit different portions of the Church in the slaveholding States, and publish among them, as I was able, the unsearchable riches of Christ. The following communication from Bishop Soule furnishes me a sufficient reason to change my arrangements, and to attend, in connection with him, the Conferences allotted to him during the winter, in the distribution of Episcopal labor.

“And now permit me, in conclusion, to tender to my brethren both of the South and South-west, my most cordial and grateful acknowledgments for their kind expressions of sympathy for me in the storm through which I have been passing, and to invoke their most fervent and continued prayers for me and mine, and especially for the Church of God. I thank them for the many affectionate invitations to attend their Conferences, and most joyfully would I have been with them but

for the reasons indicated above. May God abundantly bless us and guide us all into the way of truth and peace.

“JAMES O. ANDREW.”

—
 “*To the Rev. James O. Andrew, D. D., Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church:*

LEBANON, OHIO, Sept. 26, 1844.

“MY DEAR BISHOP,—Since the close of the recent eventful session of the General Conference I have been watching, with deep solicitude, the ‘signs of the times,’ and tracing causes, as far as I was able, to their ultimate issues. Some *general* results, growing out of the action of the Conference, it required no prophetic vision to foresee. To prevent the measures which, in my judgment, would lead to these results with demonstrative certainty, I labored day and night with prayers and tears, till the deed was done,—the eventful resolution passed. From that perilous hour my hands hung down, discouragement filled my heart, and the last hope of the *unity* of our beloved Zion well nigh fled from *earth* to *heaven*. My last effort to avert the threatening storm appears in the joint recommendation of all the Bishops to suspend all action in the case until the ensuing General Conference. At the presentation of this document some brethren perceived that instead of *light* the darkness around them was increased tenfold. *Others will judge*, have judged already. And those who come after us will examine the history of our acts. The document was *respectfully* laid upon the table, probably under the influence of deep regret that ‘our Bishops should enter the arena of controversy in the General Conference.’ *But it cannot,—does not sleep there.* I have heard many excellent ministers, and distinguished laymen in our own communion, not in the slave States, refer to it as a measure of sound Christian policy, and with deep regret that the Conference had not adopted it. Many of our Northern brethren seem now deeply to deplore the division of the Church. Oh! that there had been *forethought* as well as *afterthought*. I have seen various plans of compromise for the adjustment of our difficulties and preservation of the unity of the Church. The most prominent plan provides that a fundamental article in the treaty shall be, That no abolitionist or slaveholder shall be eligible to the office of a Bishop in the Methodist Episcopal Church. Alas for us;—Where are our men of wisdom, of experience? Where are our fathers and brethren who have analyzed the elements of civil or ecclesiastical compacts? who have studied man in his social relations? Who are the ‘high contracting parties,’ and will they create a *caste* in the constitutional eldership in the Church of Christ? Will this tend to harmonize and con-

solidate the body? Brethren North and South *will know* that the *cause* must be removed that the *effect* may cease. That the *fountain* must be dried up before the *stream* will cease to flow. But I must pause on this subject. The time has not fully arrived for me to define my position in regard to the causes and remedies of the evils which now agitate and distract our once united and peaceful body. Still I trust I have given such proofs, at different times, and under different circumstances, as not to render my position *doubtful* in the judgment of sober discriminating men, either North or South.—The General Conference spake in the language of wisdom and sound Christian policy when, in the pastoral address of 1836, it solemnly and affectionately *advised* the ministers and members of the Church to abstain from all agitation of the exciting subject of slavery and its abolition. Nor was the adoption of the Report of the committee on the memorial of our brethren from a portion of Virginia, within the bounds of the Baltimore Conference, less distinguished by the same characteristics of our holy Christianity, and the sound policy of our Discipline in providing for the case.

“It has often been asked through the public Journals, and otherwise, ‘why Bishop Andrew was not assigned his regular portion of the Episcopal work for the four ensuing years, on the plan of visitation formed by the Bishops and published in the official papers?’ It devolves on the majority of my colleagues in the Episcopacy, (if indeed we have an Episcopacy) rather than on me, to answer this question. Our difference of opinion in the premises, I have no doubt, was in Christian honesty and sincerity. Dismissing all further reference to the *painful* past till I see you in the South, let me now most cordially invite you to meet me at the Virginia Conference at Lynchburg, November 13th, 1844, should it please a gracious Providence to enable me to be there. And I earnestly desire that you would, if practicable, make your arrangements to be with me at all the Southern Conferences in my division of the work for the present year, where I am sure your services will not be ‘unacceptable.’ I am the more solicitous that you should be at Lynchburg from the fact that my present state of health creates a doubt whether I shall be able to reach it. I am now laboring, and have been for nearly three weeks, under the most severe attack of asthma which I have had for six or seven years,—some nights unable to lie down for a moment. Great prostration of the vital functions, and indeed of the whole physical system, is the consequence. But no effort of mine shall be wanting to meet my work; and the inducements to effort are greatly increased by the present position of the Church, and the hope of relief from my present affliction by the in-

fluence of a milder and more congenial climate. I cannot conclude without an expression of my sincere sympathy for you, and the second of your joys and sorrows, in the deep afflictions through which you have been called to pass. May the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ sustain you both.

“Yours with sentiments of affection and esteem,

“JOSHUA SOULE.

This invitation of Bishop Soule called down on him severe censure from the North. Dr. Elliott, Dr. Bond, Dr. Bangs, and others denounced the measure as not only unauthorized, but high-handed and in contravention of the decision of the General Conference and the Board of Bishops. That it contravened no action of the General Conference is very clear, from the fact, that whether the Bishop should labor or not was to depend on his own decision. That decision was now had, and as the General Conference had prescribed no particular mode in which it should be obtained or given, there could have been no infraction of the law or expressed will of that body in the proceeding.

As regards the Board of Bishops, the *spirit* of their decision was, that if Bishop Andrew should signify a willingness to take work on the Episcopal plan, it should be given him; and the *letter* of that decision was, that he should have work assigned him when he should make *written* application for it. That the spirit of the decision was fully met when he accepted Bishop Soule's invitation to aid him in his circuit of Conferences, can hardly be doubted; and as that acceptance was a written one, and as the Bishops had not prohibited the making of an inquiry or the giving of an invitation, which might call forth an expression of willingness to labor, or an application for work, both the spirit and the letter of the decision appear to have been sufficiently fulfilled.

But we will allow Bishop Soule to explain and defend his own course in this matter, in the following letter published in the Southern Christian Advocate, dated

“AUGUSTA, Ga., January 4, 1845.

“DEAR BROTHER,—In the editorial of the Christian Advocate and Journal of the 18th ultimo, I find the following assertion with special reference to myself: ‘He, therefore, claims for the Episcopacy—nay, for any one of the Bishops, a right to decide on the legality of any act of the General Conference, and to veto it, if, in his judgment, it is not in accordance with the Discipline of the Church. Thus a new issue is added to the one which has agitated the Church so fearfully, and one on which it is not possible to come to any compromise, without changing the cardinal principles of our ecclesiastical economy.’

This is a plain and positive assertion of Dr. Bond, relative to what I claim as the *right* of Bishops or *any one of them*. The Doctor must permit me, as plainly and positively, to assert the *direct converse* of his position, and thus change the 'new issue' from the Northern and Southern departments of the Church, to *him* and *myself*, with the hope that he may enjoy the happiness of still believing that 'there will be no division,' and yet shout 'glory to God' over propositions for compromise, without 'changing the cardinal principles of our ecclesiastical economy.' And I assure the Doctor, and all concerned, that I will heartily join with him in the shout, when a plan of compromise shall be proposed which does not invade chartered rights and privileges of any 'grade' of our ministry or membership. But that the Doctor should attempt to make me the author of a 'new issue' in this controversy, and that issue of such a nature as to preclude all compromise without a change of the fundamental principles of our Church polity, and thus transfer the responsibility of the results of the controversy from the parties concerned to me, I cannot but regard as at variance with those principles which I have been taught to believe should govern the actions of Christian ministers toward each other. The Doctor must not, he *cannot*, make me the 'scapegoat,' to bear away this responsibility from those to whom it justly belongs.

"I assert, without fear of contradiction, that I do not claim, and that I never have claimed, either for myself, or any one of the Bishops, or all of them conjointly, the 'right' which Dr. Bond charges on me as claiming. And now I cannot but sincerely and ardently desire that this 'new issue' being thus fairly made so far as I am concerned, exclusively between the Doctor and myself, it may not be made a matter of exciting agitation in the Church, in addition to all which has 'so fearfully' agitated her before, at least till the point is settled between us, on which the 'new issue' is now made.

"It is very possible that in writing my letter of invitation to Bishop Andrew to meet me at the Virginia Conference, and accompany me to the others in my Southern tour, with a view to his affording me aid in the superintendency, I may have traveled out of the record of the *official* instructions of the General Conference for the government of the 'action' of the superintendents in the Bishop's case, *according to Dr. Bond's 'sense' of those instructions*. But *according to my best judgment* of those instructions, given to the Bishops, *not to Dr. Bond*, I have done nothing but what is fully provided for, and covered by the record. And I trust I may presume, without ostentation, that I have as good a 'right' to judge of the meaning and import of *such* instructions as my good friend of the Christian

Advocate and Journal; especially as I am amenable, not to him, but to the General Conference. And I confess I should hesitate to charge Dr. Bond before the Church and the community, with 'claiming a right to veto the acts of the General Conference,' or of disregarding official instructions relating to his office, because in my judgment he had not kept within the official record. But it may be the Doctor thinks that *his office* requires him to keep us all right.

"I might have thought that the Doctor's office required him to take a more decided and active position in sustaining and carrying out the plan adopted by the General Conference for the amicable separation of the Church, and equitable division of the funds; and to have guarded his columns against the hostile attacks which were made both upon the Conference and the measure. But doubtless he acted in strict conformity to his sense of the duties of his office, in regard both to the Conference and their action in the premises. It certainly could not have been the sense of the General Conference, that any of their editors should pursue a course which was either designed or calculated to defeat their own official acts; especially one which was adopted with so great unanimity, and truly Christian sympathy and kindness, as the one here alluded to. But it does not belong to my office to accuse Doctor Bond before the Church or the public, however I might differ from him in judgment with regard to his course. He and myself are both strictly 'amenable' to a constitutional tribunal; and with all deference to the Doctor's age, and talents, and office, and high respectability, both in the civil and religious community, I must be permitted to question his 'right' to pre-judge me, either by virtue of his office, or otherwise, and that too before I can be heard in my own defence. If the Doctor thinks, *under all these circumstances*, that such a course is calculated to effect the unity and peace of the Church, an object which he so ardently desires, and at the first dawning prospect of which he shouts 'glory to God;' I can only say that in this as well as in regard to the *high probability* of the division of the Church, on which we have freely expressed our opinions before, we differ widely in judgment, and future events will show which of us is in error.

Very respectfully,

"JOSHUA SOULE."

After Bishop Andrew had been laboring with Bishop Soule for some months, in attending the Southern Conferences, a portion of the Bishops made the following publication, which, as it properly belongs to this history, is here inserted:—

"DEAR BRETHREN,—The time has arrived, when, in the judgment of the undersigned, it is proper they should respond to

calls which have been made, both privately and publicly, for authentic information in regard to the action of a majority of the Superintendents, by which the name of Bishop Andrew was omitted from the Plan of Episcopal Visitation, which was arranged at the close of the late General Conference, and published in the Christian Advocate and other official Journals of the Church. The statements which follow, will, it is believed, place that action and the grounds thereof in a view intelligible to all; and beyond this, they have neither desire nor intention to go in this communication.

“On the first day of June last, the following preamble and resolution were adopted by the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church:—

“WHEREAS, the Discipline of our Church forbids the doing any thing calculated to destroy our itinerant general Superintendency, and whereas Bishop Andrew has become connected with slavery by marriage and otherwise, and this act having drawn after it circumstances which, in the estimation of the General Conference, greatly embarrass the exercise of his office as an itinerant general Superintendent, if not in some places entirely prevent it; therefore,—

“*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the General Conference, that he desist from the exercise of his office so long as this impediment remains.

“On the 6th of June the following note was presented to the General Conference:—

“*Reverend and Dear Brethren*,—As the case of Bishop Andrew unavoidably involves the future *action* of the Superintendents, which, in their judgment, in the present position of the Bishop, they have no discretion to decide upon; they respectfully request from this General Conference *official* instruction in answer to the following questions:—

“1. Shall Bishop Andrew’s name remain as it now stands in the Minutes, Hymn Book, and Discipline, or shall it be struck off of these official records?

“2. How shall the Bishop obtain his support? As provided for in the form of Discipline, or in some other way?

“3. What work, if any, may the Bishop perform; and how shall he be appointed to his work?

“JOSHUA SOULE,

“ELIJAH HEDDING,

“BEVERLY WAUGH,

“THOMAS A. MORRIS.

“To which the General Conference responded:—

“1. *Resolved*, as the sense of this Conference, That Bishop Andrew’s name stand in the Minutes, Hymn-Book, and Discipline, as formerly.

"2. That the rule in relation to the support of a Bishop and his family, applies to Bishop Andrew.

"3. That whether in any, and if in any, in what work, Bishop Andrew be employed, is to be determined by his own decision and action, in relation to the previous action of this Conference in his case.

"In view of the aforesaid proceedings of the General Conference, the undersigned, on the 11th of June, appended their names to a paper written in the words which follow:—

"It is our opinion in regard to the action of the late General Conference in the case of Bishop Andrew, that it was designed by that body to devolve the responsibility of the exercise of the functions of his office exclusively on himself. In the absence of Bishop Andrew at the time of arranging the Plan of Episcopal Visitation for the ensuing four years, and he not having notified us of his desire, or purpose, with respect to it, we should regard ourselves as acting in contravention of the expressed will of the General Conference, if we apportioned to Bishop Andrew any definite portion thereof. But if he shall hereafter make a written application for a portion of the general oversight, we should feel ourselves justified in assigning it to him.

"After this paper was signed, and before the parting of the Superintendents, it was agreed to make out a reserved Plan of Episcopal Visitation, including Bishop Andrew in the apportionment of the work thereof, which was done, and intrusted to the safe keeping of Bishop Soule, with an explicit understanding, that if he should receive from Bishop Andrew a written application for his portion of the general Superintendence, he was then, and in that event, to publish the second or reserved plan in immediate connection with the said application, that the reason for the substitution of the second plan might accompany its publication. Such was the action of the undersigned in the case presented, and such the ground on which it was based. At present, this is all that they feel themselves called to make public.

"ELIJAH HEDDING,

"B. WAUGH,

"THOMAS A. MORRIS.

"L. L. HAMLINE."

The last General Conference had provided in the plan of separation, for taking the sense of the Annual Conferences on the subject of so changing the sixth "Restrictive Rule" as to authorize an equitable division of the Book Concern with the

Southern organization, in case the South should find such organization necessary. That body had itself recommended such a change by a vote of 147 to 12, and it only remained for the constitutional number of votes to be given in the Annual Conferences, to give the arrangement full legal effect. And as so very large a proportion of the delegates had approved the change, it was not doubted that the Conferences would readily do the same,—especially as it was a measure demanded by moral equity and common justice. This reasonable expectation was fully met by several of the Conferences which convened first after the adjournment of the General Conference, and especially the Northern Conferences, from which the South expected least; but in most of the Conferences calling themselves *conservative*, the proposition was rejected by a strong vote,—even the delegates who voted in its favor in the General Conference, opposing it in the Annual Conferences of which they were members. And before the meeting of the General Convention, in May, it was understood that the Annual Conferences had refused, so far as their votes could go to that effect, to allow to the South an equitable and just division of the property of the Book Concern.

For this course various reasons were given, such as, that it was ill-timed to vote the South their portion of the property before they had assumed a separate organization; that it had the appearance of inviting the South to separate, which they desired rather to discourage than promote, &c. It is sufficient for our present purpose that we state the fact, without speculating relative to the true cause of it. Subsequent events perhaps cast more light on the subject than previous professions.

CHAPTER IV.

Embracing the Proceedings of the Convention at Louisville, May, 1845.

THE Annual Conferences in the slaveholding States having, as we have seen in the foregoing chapter, acted with great unanimity in approving the course of the minority in the General Conference,—in expressing the opinion that separation was necessary, under the circumstances, and in approving the holding of a Convention at Louisville in May, 1845, and electing delegates to represent them in that body, the meeting of that Convention was looked to with deep and universal interest. Hundreds of ministers and members from remote points attended the Convention to witness the result of its deliberations, and the entire Church, North and South, waited with painful solicitude the final issue.

The official proceedings of that Convention, we now proceed to record, as constituting a very important part of this history.

The Convention of Delegates from the Southern and South-western Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, viz: Kentucky, Missouri, Holston, Tennessee, North Carolina, Memphis, Arkansas, Virginia, Mississippi, Texas, Alabama, Georgia, South Carolina, Florida, and Indian Mission,—elected on the basis of the Plan of Separation adopted by the General Conference, on the 8th June, 1844, assembled in the city of Louisville, Kentucky, on the 1st day of May, A. D., 1845.

The meeting was called to order at 9 o'clock, A. M., by Dr. William Capers, and Dr. Lovick Pierce, of the Georgia Conference, was elected President, *pro tem.* This venerable Minister opened the Convention by reading the second chapter of the Epistle to the Philippians; by singing the 129th Hymn, containing an appropriate invocation of the Holy Spirit, and by offering a suitable and impressive prayer to the Throne of Grace:—

Thomas N. Ralston, of the Kentucky Conference, was then chosen Secretary, *pro tem.* The Conferences represented in the Convention were then called over in the order in which they stand in the General Minutes; and the delegates presented their certificates of election,—the Convention having decided that those members who are not furnished with certificates of election shall, nevertheless, take their seats; pro-

vided that the Presiding Officer of their respective Conferences or some member present, attest their election.

The following brethren having furnished the necessary vouchers, took their seats as members of the Convention, to wit:—

KENTUCKY CONFERENCE.—Henry B. Bascom, Edward Stevenson, Hubbard H. Kavanaugh, Benjamin T. Crouch, William Gunn, George W. Taylor, George W. Brush, John C. Harrison, Burr H. McCown, James King, John James, Thomas N. Ralston.

MISSOURI CONFERENCE.—Andrew Monroe, Jesse Green, John Glanville, Wesley Browning, William Patton, John H. Lynn, Joseph Boyle, Thomas Johnson.

HOLSTON CONFERENCE.—Thomas K. Catlett, Thomas Stringfield, Rufus M. Stevens, Timothy Sallins, Creed Fulton.

TENNESSEE CONFERENCE.—Robert Paine, John B. McFerrin, Alexander L. P. Green, Fountain E. Pitts, Ambrose F. Driskill, John W. Hanner, Joshua Boucher, Thomas Maddin, Frederick G. Ferguson, Robert L. Andrews.

NORTH CAROLINA CONFERENCE.—Samuel S. Bryant, Hezekiah G. Leigh, Bennet T. Blake, Robert J. Carson, Peter Daub, John T. Braine.

MEMPHIS CONFERENCE.—Moses Brock, George W. D. Harris, William McMahon, Thomas Joyner, Asbury Davidson, Wilson L. McAlister, Thomas Smith.

ARKANSAS CONFERENCE.—John Harrell, John F. Truslow.

VIRGINIA CONFERENCE.—John Early, Thomas Crowder, William A. Smith, Leroy M. Lee, Abraham Penn, David S. Doggett, Henry B. Cowles, Anthony Dibrell.

MISSISSIPPI CONFERENCE.—Lowell Campbell.

TEXAS CONFERENCE.—Littleton Fowler, Francis Wilson.

ALABAMA CONFERENCE.—Jefferson Hamilton, Jesse Boring, Thomas H. Capers, Eugene V. Levert, Elisha Calloway, Thomas O. Summers.

GEORGIA CONFERENCE.—Lovick Pierce, James E. Evans, John W. Glenn, Samuel Anthony, Augustus B. Longstreet, Isaac Boring, James B. Payne.

SOUTH CAROLINA CONFERENCE.—William Capers, William M. Wightman, Hugh A. C. Walker, Samuel Dunwody, Bond English, Samuel W. Capers.

FLORIDA CONFERENCE.—Peyton P. Smith, Thomas C. Benning.

INDIAN MISSION CONFERENCE.—Edward T. Peery, David B. Cumming.

On motion of Augustus B. Longstreet and William Capers, it was

Resolved, That the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, now in attendance, be requested to preside over the meeting,

under such arrangements as they may make from day to day among themselves. This Resolution was adopted unanimously, by a standing vote.

Bishop Soule being present, informed the Convention that he would express his views on the subject of this Resolution, both on behalf of himself and his colleague, Bishop Andrew (who was also present,) on to-morrow morning.

On motion of John Early, it was

Resolved, That all elections for officers be by ballot, when more than one is nominated; otherwise by nomination and election.

An election of Secretary then took place, and Thomas O. Summers was, on the first balloting, duly elected. Thomas N. Ralston was, in like manner, duly elected assistant Secretary.

On motion of John Early the following Resolutions were adopted:—

Resolved, That a committee be appointed to ascertain whether or not a Reporter for the Convention can be procured, and to report on to-morrow morning.

Brothers Early, Bascom, R. Paine, Hamilton, English, Wightman, L. M. Lee, McFerrin, and George W. Brush were appointed said committee.

Resolved, That the Secretary be instructed to purchase a suitable Book in which to record the proceedings of this body.

Resolved, That a committee be appointed to draft rules for the government of the Convention.

Brothers Longstreet, W. Capers, and W. A. Smith were appointed said committee.

On motion of Edward Stevenson, it was

Resolved, That the Presiding Elder of the Louisville District, in connection with the Preachers in the several Charges of this city, be requested to supply the pulpits and superintend public worship in the different Churches that may be tendered to our use during the session of the Convention.

On motion of H. H. Kavanaugh, the Convention appointed half past eight o'clock, to-morrow morning, as the next hour of meeting, and then adjourned with prayer, by Samuel Dunwody.

FRIDAY MORNING, MAY 2.

Convention met according to adjournment. The devotional exercises were conducted by William Capers. The roll was called, and the names of Whiteford Smith, Robert J. Boyd, George F. Pierce and Greenbury Garrett were duly entered, they having furnished the necessary vouchers. The Minutes were then read, corrected, and approved.

The committee appointed to ascertain whether or not a Reporter can be procured for the Convention, reported as follows:—

The committee appointed to consider the propriety of employing a Reporter, beg to offer the following Resolution as embodying their views on the subject:—

Resolved, That William M. Wightman, Leroy M. Lee, and John B. McFerrin be a committee to prepare a full and correct synopsis of the proceedings of the Convention, and furnish the Editors of the Louisville Journal with a copy each day, at 9 o'clock, P. M., for publication the next morning, and that they be authorized to employ any assistance they may deem meet, at the expense of the Convention;—it being understood that the cost will not exceed twenty-five dollars.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

JOHN EARLY, Ch'n.

The committee's Report was adopted. The committee appointed to frame Rules for the government of the Convention, made the following Report, which was adopted:—

1. The Convention shall meet at half past eight o'clock, A. M., and adjourn at half past twelve o'clock, P. M., but may alter the times of meeting and adjournment at their discretion.

2. The President shall take the Chair precisely at the hour to which the Convention stood adjourned, and cause the same to be opened by reading the Scriptures, singing, and prayer; and on the appearance of a quorum, shall have the Journals of the preceding day read and approved, when the business of the Convention shall proceed in the following order, viz:—

1. Reports, first of the standing and then of the select committees.

2. Petitions and memorials.

3. The President shall decide all questions of order, arising under these Rules, subject to an appeal to the Convention; but in case of such appeal, the question shall be taken without debate.

4. He shall appoint all committees not otherwise specially ordered by the Convention; but any member may decline serving on more than one committee at the same time.

5. All motions or resolutions introduced by any member, shall be reduced to writing, if the President, Secretary, or any two members request it.

6. When a motion or resolution is made and seconded, or a report presented, and is read by the Secretary or stated by the President, it shall be deemed in possession of the Convention; but any motion or resolution may be withdrawn by the mover at any time before decision or amendment.

7. No new motion or resolution shall be made until the one

under consideration is disposed of; which may be done by adoption or rejection, unless one of the following motions should intervene, which motion shall have precedence in the order in which they are placed, viz: For indefinite postponement; a lying on the table; reference to a committee; postponement to a given time; amendment, or a substitute—but an amendment to an amendment, and an amendment of a substitute, shall be disposed of before the original amendment or substitute.

8. No member shall be interrupted when speaking, except by the President, to call him to order when he departs from the question—uses personalities or disrespectful language; but any member may call the attention of the President to the subject, when he deems a speaker out of order; and any member may explain if he thinks himself misrepresented.

9. When any member is about to speak in debate, or to deliver any matter to the Convention, he shall rise from his seat and respectfully address himself to the President.

10. No person shall speak more than twice on the same question, nor more than fifteen minutes at one time without leave of the Convention; nor shall any person speak more than once until every member choosing to speak shall have spoken; but any one entitled to the floor may resign his place, if he choose, to one who has spoken; in which case he will be considered as having availed himself of his privilege to speak.

11. When any motion or resolution shall have passed, it shall be in order for any member who voted in the majority to move for a re-consideration.

12. No member shall absent himself from the service of the Convention without leave, unless he be sick or unable to attend.

13. No member shall be allowed to vote on any question, who is not within the bar at the time when such question is put by the President, except by leave of the Convention, when such member has been necessarily absent.

14. Every member who shall be within the bar at the time the question is put, shall give his vote; unless the Convention, for special reason, excuse him.

15. A motion to adjourn shall always be in order, and shall be decided without debate.

Bishop Soule then rose and addressed the Convention, as follows:—

“I rise on the present occasion to offer a few remarks to this Convention of ministers, under the influence of feelings more solemn and impressive than I recollect ever to have experienced before. The occasion is certainly one of no ordinary interest and solemnity. I am deeply impressed with a con-

viction of the important results of your deliberations and decisions in relation to that numerous body of Christians and Christian ministers you here represent, and to the country at large. And knowing, as I do, the relative condition of the vast community where your acts must be extensively felt, I cannot but feel a deep interest in the business of the Convention, both as it respects yourselves, and the millions who must be affected by your decisions. With such views and feelings, you will indulge me in an expression of confident hope that all your business will be conducted with the greatest deliberation, and with that purity of heart, and moderation of temper suitable to yourselves, as a body of Christian ministers, and to the important concerns which have called you together in this city.

“The opinion which I formed at the close of the late General Conference, that the proceedings of that body would result in a division of the Church, was not induced by the impulse of excitement; but was predicated of principles and facts, after the most deliberate and mature consideration. That opinion I have freely expressed. And however deeply I have regretted such a result, believing it to be inevitable, my efforts have been made, not to prevent it, but rather that it might be attended with the least injury, and the greatest amount of good which the case would admit. I was not alone in this opinion. A number of aged and influential ministers entertained the same views. And, indeed, it is not easy to conceive how any one, intimately acquainted with the facts in the case, and the relative position of the North and South, could arrive at any other conclusion. Nothing has transpired since the close of the General Conference to change the opinion I then formed; but subsequent events have rather confirmed it. In view of the certainty of the issue, and at the same time ardently desirous that the two great divisions of the Church might be in peace and harmony within their own respective bounds, and cultivate the spirit of Christian fellowship, brotherly kindness, and charity for each other, I cannot but consider it an auspicious event that the sixteen Annual Conferences, represented in this Convention, have acted with such extraordinary unanimity in the measures they have taken in the premises. In the Southern Conferences which I have attended, I do not recollect that there has been a dissenting voice with respect to the *necessity* of a separate organization; and although their official acts in deciding the important question, have been marked with that clearness and decision which should afford satisfactory evidence that they have acted under a solemn conviction of duty to Christ, and to the people of their charge, they have been equally distinguished by moderation and candor. And as far

as I have been informed, all the other Conferences have pursued a similar course.

"It is ardently to be desired that the same unanimity may prevail in the counsels of this Convention as distinguished, in such a remarkable manner, the views, and deliberations, and decisions of your constituents. When it is recollected that it is not only for yourselves, and the present ministry and membership of the Conferences you represent, that you are assembled on this occasion; but that millions of the present race, and generations yet unborn, may be affected, in their most essential interests, by the results of your deliberations, it will occur to you how important it is that you should "do all things as in the immediate presence of God." Let all your acts, dear brethren, be accompanied with much prayer for that *wisdom which is from above*.

"While you are thus impressed with the importance and solemnity of the subject which has occasioned the Convention, and of the high responsibility under which you act, I am confident you will cultivate the spirit of Christian moderation and forbearance; and that in all your acts you will keep strictly within the limits and provisions of the "plan of separation" adopted by the General Conference with great unanimity and apparent Christian kindness. I can have no doubt of the firm adherence of the ministers and members of the Church in the Conferences you represent, to the doctrines, rules, order of government, and forms of worship contained in our excellent book of discipline. For myself, I stand upon the basis of Methodism as contained in this book, and from it I intend never to be removed. I cannot be insensible to the expression of your confidence in the resolution you have unanimously adopted, requesting me to preside over the Convention in conjunction with my colleagues. And after having weighed the subject with careful deliberation, I have resolved to accept your invitation, and discharge the duties of the important trust to the best of my ability. My excellent colleague, Bishop Andrew, is of the same mind, and will cordially participate in the duties of the Chair.

"I am requested to state to the Convention, that our worthy and excellent colleague, Bishop Morris, believes it to be his duty to decline a participation in the presidential duties. He assigns such reasons for so doing as are, in the judgment of his colleagues, perfectly satisfactory; and it is presumed they would be considered in the same light by the Convention. In conclusion, I trust that all things will be done in that spirit which will be approved of God. And devoutly pray that your acts may result in the advancement of the Redeemer's kingdom, and the salvation of the souls of men."

Bishop Soule then took the Chair, which was courteously vacated by Dr. Pierce.

On motion of John Early, it was

Resolved, That the business of committees be transacted in the absence of all other persons than the members of the Convention.

On motion of Dr. Capers, it was

Resolved, That a committee of fifteen delegates be appointed to prepare a Plan to be recommended to the several Annual Conferences represented in this Convention, for the management and support of Missions connected with said Conferences; and that this committee report within the next eight days.

John G. Jones, Green M. Rogers, Benjamin M. Drake, Samuel W. Speer, and William H. Watkins presented their certificates of election to the Convention,—their names were enrolled,—and took their seats accordingly.

The Convention then designated the third pillar from the altar the *bar* of the House.

On motion of J. Early and W. A. Smith, it was

Resolved, That a committee of *two* members, from each Annual Conference represented in this Convention, be appointed, whose duty it shall be to take into consideration the propriety and necessity of a Southern organization, according to the plan of separation adopted by the late General Conference; together with the acts of the several Annual Conferences on this subject, and report the best method of securing the objects contemplated in the appointment of this Convention.

On motion of John Early and Thomas Crowder the foregoing committee was chosen by the respective delegation, and are as follows:—

Kentucky Conference.—Henry B. Bascom and Edward Stevenson.

Missouri.—William Patton and Andrew Monroe.

Holston.—Thomas K. Catlett and Thomas Stringfield.

Tennessee.—Robert Paine and Fountain E. Pitts.

North Carolina.—Hezekiah G. Leigh and Peter Daub.

Memphis.—George W. D. Harris and Moses Brock.

Arkansas.—John Harrell and John F. Truslow.

Virginia.—John Early and William A. Smith.

Mississippi.—William Winans and Benjamin M. Drake.

Texas.—Francis Wilson and Littleton Fowler.

Alabama.—Jefferson Hamilton and Jesse Boring.

Georgia.—Lovick Pierce and Augustus B. Longstreet.

South Carolina.—William Capers and William M. Wightman.

Florida.—Thomas C. Benning and Peyton P. Smith.

Indian Mission.—Edward T. Peery and David B. Cumming.

Certain documents were presented by John Early and Leroy M. Lee; also communications from members of the Methodist Episcopal Church on the Lexington District and in Newport station, Kentucky Conference, all of which were referred to the Committee on Organization—as also a communication from the Rev. Stephen Chipley.

On motion of John Early, it was

Resolved, That all memorials on Church Organization be referred without vote to the same committee.

On motion of Dr. William Capers, it was

Resolved, That the committee on Missions be constituted of fifteen delegates, one from each Annual Conference.

A communication from the Young Men's Mercantile Library Association of Louisville, inviting the members of the Convention to the use of their Library and Reading Room, having been received and read, on motion of Dr. Lovick Pierce, it was

Resolved, That the thanks of the Convention be tendered, through the Secretary, to the Association for their polite invitation.

Religious exercises then ensued, in which Dr. William Capers, father William Burke, Bishop Morris, and Bishop Soule took the lead. The Convention then adjourned.

SATURDAY MORNING, MAY 3.

Convention met. Bishop Andrew in the chair. The devotional exercises were conducted by the venerable John Early, of the Virginia Conference.

The roll was then called, and the names of William Winans, of the Mississippi Conference, and Thomas Sanford, of the Georgia Conference, were duly entered—they having produced the necessary vouchers.

Certain communications, on organization, were received from the Rev. William Burke, of Cincinnati, J. H. Moore of Lexington, Missouri, from Shelbyville station, Kentucky Conference, by Edward Stevenson—also from Lexington district; from Good Hope, No Creek Society, Yelvington circuit, Hardinsburg district; from Minerva and Flemingsburg circuits, Augusta and Hardinsburg districts, Kentucky Conference—and from Batesville station, Arkansas Conference. These were all referred to the Committee on Organization.

On motion of Dr. A. B. Longstreet, it was

Resolved, That after Tuesday, the sixth instant, no new Memorial, or Petition, will be referred to the Committee on Organization.

On motion of Alexander L. P. Green, Bishop Soule was re-

quested to furnish for publication the remarks which he submitted to the Convention on yesterday.

The Bishop then presented the list of members of the Mission committee—it is as follows:—

South Carolina Conference.—Dr. William Capers.

Georgia.—James E. Evans.

Virginia.—Thomas Crowder.

Texas.—Littleton Fowler.

Missouri.—Thomas Johnson.

Kentucky.—Hubbard H. Kavanaugh.

Holston.—Creed Fulton.

Tennessee.—Alexander L. P. Green.

North Carolina.—Bennet T. Blake.

Memphis.—William McMahon.

Mississippi.—Samuel W. Speer.

Alabama.—Elisha Callaway.

Florida.—Peyton P. Smith.

Indian Mission.—Edward T. Peery.

Arkansas.—John Harrell.

The Convention then adjourned with the benediction, by the Presiding Bishop—giving the remainder of the morning to the committee on organization.

MONDAY MORNING, MAY 5.

Convention met. Opened with the usual devotions by Dr. William Winans, of the Mississippi Conference. The roll was called, and the name of Robert Alexander duly entered—he having presented his certificate of election by the Texas Conference. Minutes read and approved.

Certain communications were received and referred to the Committee on Organization, to wit:—

Two by William A. Smith, from J. Stewart, Kanawha district, Ohio Conference.

Two by Benjamin T. Crouch, from Hardinsburg district, and one from Millersburg circuit, Lexington district, Kentucky Conference.

One by John Harrell, from Fayetteville circuit, Arkansas Conference.

One by Edward Stevenson, from Jeffersontown and Cane-run Classes, Jeffersontown circuit.

On motion of Dr. William Winans, it was

Resolved, That the Committee on Organization be instructed to inquire whether or not anything has transpired, during the past year, to render it possible to maintain the unity of the

Methodist Episcopal Church, under the same General Conference jurisdiction, without the ruin of Southern Methodism.

On motion of Benjamin M. Drake, it was

Resolved, That the Committee on Organization be, and are hereby instructed to inquire into the propriety of reporting resolutions in case a division should take place, leaving the way open for re-union on terms which shall not compromise the interest of the *Southern*, and which shall meet, as far as may be, the views of the *Northern* portion of the Church.

Dr. William A. Smith and Dr. Lovick Pierce presented the following resolution, which at their request was laid on the table, to be taken up on to-morrow morning.

Resolved, By the delegates of the several Annual Conferences in the Southern and South-western States, in General Convention assembled, That we cannot sanction the action of the late General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, on the subject of slavery, by remaining under the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of that body, without deep and lasting injury to the interests of the Church and the country; we, therefore, hereby instruct the committee on organization, that if upon a careful examination of the whole subject, they find that there is no reasonable ground to hope that the Northern majority will recede from their position and give some safe guaranty for the future security of our civil and ecclesiastical rights, that they report in favor of a separation from the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the said General Conference.

On motion of Thomas Crowder the Convention then adjourned, with the benediction, by Bishop Soule, the presiding Bishop.

TUESDAY MORNING, MAY 6.

Convention met. Bishop Andrew in the chair. The session was opened with the usual devotions by George W. D. Harris, of the Memphis Conference. The reading of the roll was dispensed with. The Minutes were read and approved.

Certain communications were received and referred to the Committee on Organization, to wit:—

Three by Dr. Henry B. Bascom, viz: one from Brook Street station, Louisville; one from Hartford circuit, Hardinsburg District; and one from Bowling Green station, Kentucky Conference.

One by William Gunn, from Louisville circuit, Kentucky Conference.

One by Hubbard H. Kavanaugh, from Brook Street station, Louisville, Kentucky Conference.

Dr. William A. Smith then delivered an elaborate speech

in support of the resolution which he laid on the table on yesterday.

On motion of Dr. Augustus B. Longstreet, the Convention then adjourned, with the benediction by the presiding Bishop.

WEDNESDAY MORNING, MAY 7.

Convention met. Bishop Andrew in the Chair. The session was opened with the usual devotions by Thomas Crowder, of the Virginia Conference. The Minutes were read and approved. Bishop Andrew then vacated the Chair, which was taken by Bishop Soule.

The resolution under discussion was read and supported by Dr. Lovick Pierce, in an able speech of the length of an hour and a half. Dr. William Capers followed in support of the resolution, and spoke with great pathos for three quarters of an hour.

On motion of James E. Evans, the Convention then adjourned, with the benediction by the Bishop; giving the remainder of the morning to the Committee on Organization.

THURSDAY MORNING, MAY 8.

Convention met. The Bishops not being present, Dr. Lovick Pierce was called to the Chair, and the session was opened with the usual devotions by Benjamin T. Crouch, of the Kentucky Conference. Bishop Soule then appeared and took the Chair. The Minutes were read and approved.

The name of Jacob Custer was entered on the roll of the Convention; he having furnished his certificate of election by the Arkansas Conference.

A communication from J. Cobb, Dean of the Faculty of the Medical Institute of Louisville, was received and read by the Secretary. On motion of William M. Wightman, the Secretary was instructed to write a letter of thanks in recognition of the courtesy.

On motion of Bennet T. Blake, the resolution under discussion was laid on the table for the present.

On motion of John Early,

Resolved, That a committee be appointed to be called the Committee on Education, whose duty it shall be to take into consideration the condition of our schools and colleges, and recommend the best method of improving them.

On motion of John Early,

Resolved, That a committee be appointed to be called the Committee on Finance, whose duty shall be to consider the

best method of securing a just portion of the Book Concern and Chartered Fund, and recommend the best financial system for our future operation.

The resolution of Dr. William A. Smith was then taken up, on motion of Lewell Campbell, and sustained by him in a few earnest and appropriate remarks. He was followed, in an eloquent speech of an hour's length, by George F. Pierce, of the Georgia Conference.

On motion of Thomas C. Benning, the Convention then adjourned, to meet at 10½ o'clock on to-morrow morning; the Bishop pronouncing the benediction.

FRIDAY MORNING, MAY 9.

Convention met pursuant to adjournment. Bishop Andrew in the chair. The usual devotions were conducted by Andrew Monroe, of the Missouri Conference. The Minutes were read and approved.

Reports being called for, the Committee on Missions not being ready to make their report, asked longer time, which was granted them.

The Bishop announced the Committee on Finance. It is composed of the following members:—John Early, Lovick Pierce, William Winans, Alexander L. P. Green, Benjamin T. Crouch.

He announced, also, the Committee on Education. The following members constitute that committee:—Robert Paine, Augustus B. Longstreet, David S. Doggett, Burr H. McCown, Benjamin M. Drake, Creed Fulton, Wesley Browning, Littleton Fowler, Samuel S. Bryant.

On motion of John B. McFerrin,

Resolved, That the Committee on Finance be instructed to devise ways and means to defray the expenses incurred by Bishops Soule and Andrew in attending this Convention, and report accordingly.

The resolution of Dr. William A. Smith was then called up, and supported by Dr. Augustus B. Longstreet, in a speech that ran beyond the hour of adjournment, which took place, with the benediction by the Bishop.

SATURDAY MORNING, MAY 10.

Convention met. Bishop Andrew in the chair. The usual religious exercises were conducted by James E. Evans, of the Georgia Conference. The Minutes were read and approved.

A communication from W. F. Bullock, President of the Kentucky Institution of the Blind, inviting the members of the

Convention to visit the Institution, was received and read by the Secretary, who, on motion of Thomas Crowder, was instructed to return the thanks of the Convention to the President of said Institution for the polite invitation.

A communication from the members of Durrett's class, Rock circuit, Missouri Conference, signed by Charles Carthra and Mortimer D. Gaines, praying for a separate organization, was handed in by Jesse Green, and read by the Secretary.

On motion of John Early, the Secretary was instructed to forward a certain communication from the Ministers of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Louisville, Kentucky, to the Rev. Dr. Elliott, editor of the Western Christian Advocate, correcting certain misstatements which occurred in his paper of May 9th, in regard to alleged movements in this city in opposition to the Southern organization.

John B. McFerrin asked leave to go home, for reasons which he assigned. The Convention could not grant his request.

Littleton Fowler asked leave to absent himself until Monday next—it was granted him.

The resolution of Dr. William A. Smith was then taken up, and Dr. Augustus B. Longstreet continued his speech for one hour. He was followed by the venerable Samuel Dunwody, of the South Carolina Conference, who reasoned well on the resolution for more than an hour. Dr. William Capers made a few explanatory remarks, after which Dr. Robert Paine claimed the floor, and on motion of Thomas C. Benning, the Convention adjourned, with the benediction by Dr. Lovick Pierce, who, for the time being, was filling the Chair.

MONDAY MORNING, MAY 12.

Convention met. Bishop Andrew in the chair. The usual devotions were conducted by Dr. Lovick Pierce, of the Georgia Conference. The Minutes were read and approved.

Certain Petitions from the citizens of Memphis, asking the location of the Southern Book Concern in that city, were presented by Moses Brock—read and laid on the table. On motion of Edward Stevenson, a committee was ordered, to whom such memorials may be referred.

A similar Petition from the Brook-street Charge, Louisville, Kentucky, was received, read, and placed with the foregoing.

The resolution of Dr. William A. Smith was then taken up, and its merits discussed, most ably and patiently, in a speech, by Dr. Robert Paine. The Bishop then announced the committee on the Book Concern and Periodicals,—it consists of the following members:—Dr. William Winans, Edward Stevenson, Moses Brock, Hugh A. C. Walker, Thomas Crowder,

and on motion of Andrew Monroe, Thomas Johnson was added to the foregoing.

William Winans asked to be released from serving on the Committee on Finance. At his nomination, John G. Jones was chosen to supply his place.

Thomas Crowder, of the Virginia Conference, claimed the floor, and, on motion of Hezekiah G. Leigh, the Convention adjourned with the benediction by the Bishop.

TUESDAY MORNING, MAY 13.

Convention met. Bishop Andrew in the chair. Opened with the usual services by Thomas Johnson, of the Missouri Conference. The Minutes were read and approved.

The resolution of Dr. William A. Smith was then taken up and sustained for about one hour, in a speech by Thomas Crowder, of the Virginia Conference.

On motion of George W. Brush, the discussion of the Resolution was suspended to give him an opportunity to present certain communications from the stations of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Louisville, Kentucky, praying for the location of the Book Concern and Newspaper in said city. One of the documents was read, and all were referred to the appropriate committee.

James E. Evans offered the following resolution:—

Resolved, That in the judgment of the Convention, it is not necessary that the general causes and necessities for a separate organization should be discussed any longer,—unless some members from the border Conferences should think it necessary to do so, in order to represent their portion of the Church correctly.

George W. Brush, of the Kentucky Conference, made a few felicitous remarks, and was followed by Hubbard H. Kavanaugh of the same Conference, who favored the Convention with an excellent speech. Thomas Stringfield, of the Holston Conference, made a few remarks, and was succeeded by William Patton and Andrew Monroe, of the Missouri Conference, and William Gunn of the Kentucky Conference. On motion of Fountain E. Pitts, of the Tennessee Conference, the session was extended fifteen minutes, in favor of the last speaker, who concluded before the time expired, and John C. Harrison, of the Kentucky Conference, followed and spoke beyond the hour of adjournment, which took place with the benediction by the Bishop.

WEDNESDAY^AMORNING, MAY 14.

Convention met. Bishop Soule in the chair. The usual religious exercises were conducted by Hezekiah G. Leigh, of the North Carolina Conference. The Minutes were read and approved.

The Committee on Finance made their report, which, on motion of Hezekiah G. Leigh, was laid on the table.

On motion of Leroy M. Lee, the Report was ordered to be printed.

On motion of John Early, the Publication Committee were instructed not to print it in the newspaper of to-morrow.

The Committee on Missions made their report, which, on motion of the chairman of said committee, was laid on the table.

A Petition from Nashville, Tennessee, praying the establishment of the Book Concern, and the holding of the first Southern General Conference in that city, was presented by Messrs. McFerrin, Harris, Hanner, and Pitts; it was read and referred to the appropriate committee.

On motion of John Early, the resolution of James E. Evans was taken up; whereupon, Fountain E. Pitts, of the Tennessee Conference, occupied half an hour in a speech. He was followed by Moses Brock, of the Memphis Conference, who paved the way for William McMahon, of the same Conference, who entertained the Convention for half an hour. He was followed by William Gunn and Benjamin T. Crouch of the Kentucky Conference, William A. Smith, of the Virginia Conference, George W. D. Harris of the Memphis Conference, and Thomas K. Catlett, of the Holston Conference.

The resolution of James E. Evans was then withdrawn.

The resolution of Dr. Smith was then taken up, and after a few remarks in its support by Joseph Boyle and Jesse Green, of the Missouri Conference, and Littleton Fowler, of the Texas Conference, was adopted, with one dissenting vote.

On motion of Hezekiah G. Leigh, the Convention then adjourned, with the benediction by the Bishop.

THURSDAY MORNING, MAY 15.

Convention met. Bishop Andrew in the chair. The usual devotions were conducted by Jonathan Stamper, of the Illinois Conference. The Minutes were read and approved.

A memorial from the Mayor and City Council, one from upwards of 250 citizens, and another from 51 lawyers, of the city of Louisville, Ky., praying for the location of the Book

Concern and newspaper in said city, were presented by George W. Brush, of the Kentucky Conference; read and referred to the appropriate committee.

On motion of Dr. William A. Smith, the Convention resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole, to take under consideration the report of the Committee on Missions.

In about an hour, the Committee of the Whole rose, and, the Convention being resumed, the chairman reported that the committee had, according to order, had under consideration the report in question, and had made progress therein; but not having time to go through the same, had directed him to ask leave to sit again. On motion of Thomas Crowder, of the Virginia Conference, the request was granted.

It was then announced that the Committee on Organization were prepared to make their report. Nearly two hours were occupied by Dr. Bascom, the chairman of the committee, in reading that elaborate document.

On motion of Drs. William A. Smith and William Capers, the report was accepted, and the Publishing Committee were instructed to print one hundred copies for the use of the convention.

Dr. Winans was excused from serving on the Book Concern, and, on his motion, Alexander L. P. Green was chosen to fill his place.

Dr. Paine was excused from serving on the Committee on Education. George F. Pierce was chosen in his place.

On motion of Leroy M. Lee, the Convention then adjourned, with the benediction by the Bishop.

FRIDAY MORNING, MAY 16.

Convention met. Bishop Soule in the chair. The usual devotions were conducted by Jefferson Hamilton, of the Alabama Conference. The Minutes were read and approved.

On motion of Samuel S. Bryant, of the North Carolina, and Thomas Crowder, of the Virginia Conference, the Convention resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole, to take under further consideration the report of the Committee on Missions. John James, of the Kentucky Conference, was called to the chair.

At 12 o'clock the committee rose, and, the Convention being resumed, the chairman presented the report of the committee; which, on motion, was laid on the table.

On motion of Leroy M. Lee, the Convention then adjourned, with the benediction by the Bishop.

SATURDAY MORNING, MAY 17.

Convention met. Bishop Andrew in the chair. Religious exercises were conducted by Joshua Boucher, of the Tennessee Conference. The Minutes were read and approved.

A communication from certain persons in Frankfort, Kentucky, praying for the location of a newspaper in said city, was presented by Dr. Bascom, and, on motion of Dr. Capers, referred to the Committee on the Book Concern and Periodicals.

On motion of John Early, of the Virginia Conference, the report of the Committee on Organization was taken up, and the Convention resolved to act on it by *yeas* and *nays*—sick and absent members being permitted to enter their votes at some subsequent period during the session.

The first resolution was read, and, on motion of John Early, was adopted, as follows:—

Be it resolved, by the Delegates of the several Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the Slaveholding States, in General Convention assembled, That it is right, expedient, and necessary to erect the Annual Conferences represented in this Convention, into a distinct ecclesiastical connexion, separate from the jurisdiction of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, as at present constituted; and accordingly, we, the delegates of said Annual Conferences, acting under the provisional plan of separation adopted by the General Conference of 1844, do solemnly declare the jurisdiction hitherto exercised over said Annual Conferences, by the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, entirely dissolved; and that said Annual Conferences shall be, and they hereby are constituted, a separate ecclesiastical connexion, under the provisional plan of separation aforesaid, and based upon the Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church, comprehending the doctrines and entire moral, ecclesiastical, and economical rules and regulations of said Discipline, except only, in so far as verbal alterations may be necessary to a distinct organization, and to be known by the style and title of the METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, SOUTH.

YEAS.—Henry B. Bascom, Edward Stevenson, Hubbard H. Kavanaugh, Benjamin T. Crouch, George W. Brush, Burr H. McCown, James King, John James, Thomas N. Ralston, Andrew Monroe, Jesse Green, John Glanville, Wesley Browning, William Patton, John H. Linn, Joseph Boyle, Thomas Johnson, Thomas K. Catlett, Thomas Stringfield, Rufus M. Stevens, Timothy Sullins, Creed Fulton, Robert Paine, John B. McFerrin, Alexander L. P. Green, Fountain E. Pitts, Ambrose F. Driskill, John W. Hanner, Joshua Boucher, Thomas Maddin,

Frederick G. Ferguson, Robert L. Andrews, Samuel S. Bryant, Hezekiah G. Leigh, Bennet T. Blake, Robert J. Carson, Peter Doub, John T. Brame, Moses Brock, George W. D. Harris, Wm. McMahon, Thomas Joyner, Asbury Davidson, Wilson L. McAlister, Thomas Smith, John Harrell, John F. Truslow, Jacob Custer, John Early, Thomas Crowder, William A. Smith, Leroy M. Lee, Abraham Penn, David S. Doggett, Henry B. Cowles, Anthony Dibrell, Lewell Campbell, John G. Jones, Green M. Rogers, Benjamin M. Drake, Samuel W. Speer, William H. Watkins, William Winans, Littleton Fowler, Francis Wilson, Robert Alexander, Jefferson Hamilton, Jesse Boring, Thomas H. Capers, Eugene V. Levert, Elisha Calloway, Thomas O. Summers, Greenbury Garrett, Lovick Pierce, James E. Evans, John W. Glenn, Samuel Anthony, Augustus B. Longstreet, Isaac Boring, James B. Payne, George F. Pierce, Thomas Samford, William Capers, William M. Wightman, Hugh A. C. Walker, Samuel Dunwoody, Bond English, Samuel W. Capers, Whiteford Smith, Robert J. Boyd, Peyton P. Smith, Thomas C. Benning, Edward T. Peery, David B. Cumming—94.

NAYS—William Gunn, George W. Taylor, John C. Harrison—3.

The second resolution was then read, and on motion of Thomas Crowder, of the Virginia Conference, adopted, as follows:—

Resolved, That we cannot abandon or compromise the principles of action, upon which we proceed to a separate organization in the South; nevertheless, cherishing a sincere desire to maintain Christian union and fraternal intercourse with the Church North, we shall always be ready, kindly and respectfully, to entertain, and duly and carefully consider, any proposition or plan, having for its object the union of the two great bodies, in the North and South, whether such proposed union be *jurisdictional* or *connectional*.

YEAS.—Bascom, Stevenson, Kavanaugh, Crouch, Gunn, Taylor, Brush, Harrison, McCown, King, James, Ralston, Monroe, J. Green, Glanville, Browning, Patton, Linn, Boyle, Johnson, Catlett, Stringfield, Stevens, Sullins, Fulton, Paine, McFerrin, A. L. P. Green, Pitts, Driskill, Hanner, Boucher, Maddin, Ferguson, Andrews, Bryant, Leigh, Blake, Carson, Doub, Brame, Brock, Harris, McMahon, Joyner, Davidson, McAlister, T. Smith, Harrell, Truslow, Custer, Early, Crowder, W. A. Smith, Lee, Penn, Doggett, Cowles, Dibrell, Campbell, Jones, Rogers, Drake, Speer, Watkins, Winans, Fowler, Wilson, Alexander, Hamilton, Boring, T. H. Capers, Levert, Calloway, Summers, Garrett, L. Pierce, Evans, Glenn, Anthony,

Longstreet, Boring, Payne, G. F. Pierce, Samford, W. Capers, Wightman, Walker, Dunwody, English, S. W. Capers, W. Smith, Boyd, P. P. Smith, Benning, Peery, Cumming—97.

NAYS—None.

The Committee on Organization then presented an additional report, which was amended and adopted, in the following form:—

1. *Resolved*, That this Convention request the Bishops, presiding at the ensuing session of the border Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, *South*, to incorporate into the aforesaid Conferences any societies or stations adjoining the line of division, provided such societies or stations, by a majority of the members, according to the provisions of the plan of separation adopted by the late General Conference, request such an arrangement.

2. *Resolved*, That answer 2d of 3d section, chapter 1st of the Book of Discipline, be so altered and amended as to read as follows:—

“The General Conference shall meet on the first day of May, in the year of our Lord, 1846, in the town of Petersburg, Virginia, and thenceforward in the month of April or May, once in four years successively; and in such place and on such day as shall be fixed on by the preceding General Conference, &c.”

3. *Resolved further*, That the first answer in the same chapter be altered by striking out the word “*twenty-one*,” and inserting in its place *fourteen*.

YEAS.—Baseom, Stevenson, Kavanaugh, Crouch, Gunn, Taylor, Brush, Harrison, McCown, King, James, Ralston, Monroe, J. Green, Glanville, Browning, Patton, Linn, Boyle, Johnson, Catlett, Stringfield, Stevens, Sullins, Fulton, Paine, McFerrin, A. L. P. Green, Pitts, Driskill, Hanner, Boucher, Maddin, Ferguson, Andrews, Bryant, Leigh, Blake, Carson, Doub, Brame, Brock, Harris, McMahon, Joyner, Davidson, McAlister, T. Smith, Harrell, Truslow, Custer, Early, Crowder, W. A. Smith, Lee, Penn, Doggett, Cowles, Dibrell, Campbell, Jones, Rogers, Drake, Speer, Watkins, Winans, Fowler, Wilson, Alexander, Hamilton, Boring, T. H. Capers, Levert, Calloway, Summers, Garrett, L. Pierce, Evans, Glenn, Anthony, Longstreet, J. Boring, Payne, G. F. Pierce, Samford, W. Capers, Wightman, Walker, Dunwody, English, S. W. Capers; Smith, Boyd, P. P. Smith, Thomas C. Benning, Peery, Cumming—97.

NAYS.—None.

The Report of the Committee on Finance was then taken

up, and, on motion of Dr. William Capers, the following resolution was adopted as a substitute:—

Resolved, That it appears not to be necessary at present to appoint commissioners or agents, as provided for in the plan of separation adopted by the late General Conference. Nevertheless, we recommend the same to the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, as proper to be done, so soon as it can be with effect.

The Report of the Committee on Missions, as amended by the Committee of the Whole, was then taken up, and, with the accompanying letter, adopted, as follows:—

The committee to whom was referred the subject of providing for the management and support of Missions, respectfully report,

That in view of the present aspect of our missionary fields, and our position in relation to them, the whole subject referred—always interesting and important—becomes eminently vital and essential. And your committee, having passed in review the condition and prospects of the several missions belonging to the Southern division of the Church, and examined with due deliberation and intense solicitude the questions which have arisen as to the means of supporting them, have arrived at the conclusion, that, though in other circumstances it should seem plausible to change materially our system of finance, it is best for the present to introduce no changes but such as are necessary to conform our missionary system to our Church organization. And we deem it to be reason enough for this conclusion, that even changes which might prove advantageous after they had become familiar to the numerous persons to be moved by them, would, at their introduction, be less productive for the want of familiarity, and the present juncture imperatively requires a plan for immediate production.

Your committee, therefore, do respectfully offer the following resolutions, as specifying what is requisite to be done at the present time, and as comprehending, in connection with what is provided in the Book of Discipline, all which appears to them suitable in our circumstances.

1. *Resolved*, That until a General Conference of the Annual Conferences represented in this Convention, shall have ordered otherwise, the Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church, in the city of Louisville, Ky., shall be regarded as the central or parent society for said Conferences.—said society having previously changed its title, and adopted a constitution agreeably to the purport of these resolutions.

2. That the Board of Managers of the central society aforesaid, shall appoint two assistant Treasurers—of whom one

shall be resident in the city of Charleston, and the other in the city of New Orleans, to whom monies designed for the General Treasury may be remitted; and who shall make quarterly exhibits to the Treasurer at Louisville, of their receipts and disbursements, severally.

3. That the Board of Managers of each Annual Conference, auxiliary, supply the demands of the Missions of its Annual Conference, as far as it can be done, notifying the Bishop or President of the Conference, of any deficiency for which he may draw on the General Treasurer at Louisville, or on one of the assistant Treasurers at Charleston or New Orleans. And in case there be a surplus with any of the Conference Societies, the Treasurer of such society shall forthwith transmit it to the General Treasurer, or one of the assistant Treasurers.

4. That the Bishops be requested to aid the central Board with their counsel, as to the appropriation of the funds; and that the brethren, Alexander L. P. Green, Jerome C. Berryman, Benjamin M. Drake, Littleton Fowler, William Capers, and Hubbard H. Kavanaugh, be a committee for the same purpose.

5. That the missions connected with the Southern division of the Church *must* be sustained, and, with the blessing of God, *shall* be; and that this may be done with greater facility, it is enjoined on all missionaries to make quarterly reports of the work in their missions through one of our Church papers.

And your committee beg leave further to offer the accompanying Letter, which they respectfully propose to be adopted as your own.

The Southern and South-western Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, assembled by their delegates in Convention, in the city of Louisville, Ky., to the ministers constituting said Conferences, and to all the brethren, greeting:

Previously to the receipt of this, beloved brethren, you will have understood, that the Convention, whose letter this is, has carried into effect the object of its appointment, by forming our sixteen Annual Conferences (to wit, Missouri, Kentucky, Virginia, Holston, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Tennessee, Memphis, Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas, Florida, East Texas, West Texas, and the Indian Mission Conference) into a distinct ecclesiastical connection, agreeably to the provision of the late General Conference. By this act, the relation which has hitherto existed between our Indian missions, the missions in Texas, our domestic missions, (or missions to the people of color,) and those to the German immigrants within our bounds, is necessarily changed, both for the management of them, and

their support. A great and weighty responsibility has thus been devolved on us—on you. And we would not disguise, but freely unbosom to you, brethren beloved, how deep a solicitude we have felt that we all may approve ourselves as the servants of Christ in this matter, and make it manifest with how simple and sincere a desire we have been moved in all that we have done, that God may be glorified.

The first hint afforded in the Holy Scriptures of the expediency of adopting a separation of jurisdiction as a remedy for unmanageable differences in the Church, and to keep the ministry to their holy work of preaching Christ, without distracting controversies, (Gal. ii, 1-10,) is accompanied with an express stipulation on behalf of the poor. That Scripture act of separation, or division, was the work of the Apostles, moved, no doubt, by the Spirit of God; and in circumstances by no means dissimilar, it behooves us to practice the lesson which it inculcates, by devising liberal things.

And how numerous are the poor who must be destitute of the gospel without our ministry. Consider the many hundreds of thousands of the African race, who, though dwelling in our midst, cannot be served by the circuit appointments—German immigrants—the thousands of families scattered over the least favored parts of Florida and Arkansas, (where it is computed that the ministry cannot be sustained in the ratio of one to every fifty miles square)—East and West Texas—the tribes of Indians included in our Mission Conference—and the vast range of the farther tribes, from the borders of Mexico to the Rocky Mountains. How wide is the field! And what a call is this, of so many kindreds, colors, and conditions of men, in our national territory, crying to us for the gospel of Christ? This gospel they must have. The negro in his bonds—our citizen people in their far-off homes—the strangers among us from a foreign land—the Indian in the wilderness, whither he has retreated that we might possess his lands and become great in the earth—they *must* have the gospel. They all must have it, and we must give it to them. We have meant this, all this, and nothing but this, in all that we have done. We feel that our action in this Convention pledges us anew for the maintenance of that great motive principle of Methodism, that the gospel must be preached, with all our might, to as many as we can, and at all hazards. And your action, brethren, without which ours might not have been attempted, pledges you to sustain us to the utmost of your power. Nor can we in the least distrust you, but rest satisfied that our confidence in you will never be put to shame. You will suffer no good work which has been begun to stop at its beginning, and nothing in progress to be put back, on account of its becoming

connected with a Southern General Conference or a Southern Missionary Society. And satisfied we are, that no harm need happen in any quarter, from the present posture of affairs, if you, brethren, will unite with us as one man in a hearty resolution that by God's help, *there shall no harm happen*. Indeed, we see not but instead of harm, (to the general cause at least) much good may result. The very act which removes us from under the jurisdiction of a General Conference like the last, removes out of the way the chief hindrance to the preaching of the gospel to the colored population. It must operate favorably on the public mind in Texas also; and yet more among the Indians. We hope, indeed, that it will prove a means of recovering the ground so unhappily lost in the Creek Nation, partly by abolition intermeddling, some years ago.

Whether we direct our attention then to our colored population, or to the German immigrants, or to the least favored parts of the States of Arkansas and Florida, or to Texas, or to the Indian Mission Conference, "a great door and effectual" is opened to us, and every Christian consideration urges that we enter and occupy in our Master's name. We would, especially at the present juncture, have you consider how great the work is which has been devolved to us in the Indian Conference; as it is probable that you are less acquainted with it, both as to its extent and cost, than with other portions of the missionary field which lie nearer to you. Besides teachers and others not exclusively employed as preachers of the gospel, we have twenty white missionaries and twelve Indian preachers, (of whom seven are regular itinerants,) and about four thousand Church members, among some twenty tribes of Indians, of whom the Cherokees, Choctaws, Chicasaws, Creeks, Seminoles, Senecas, Quapaws, Osages, Kansas, Potwattamies, Chippeways, Ottawa, Peoria, Miami, Shawnees, Kickapoos, Delawares, and Wyandotts, are the principal. Their numbers are about 90,000, and there are some 20,000 negroes (slaves) among them. We have also four schools, at which nearly three hundred children, of both sexes, are taught the rudiments of English education, and some knowledge of the mechanic arts, agriculture, and housewifery. And these schools are so situated that children belonging to some twenty tribes partake of the benefit. These tribes are rapidly advancing to a degree of civilization; and ours is the responsible and interesting office of serving as their guides. Shall their advancement be accompanied with the lights of virtue and religion, or left to the misguiding influences of vice and infidelity? Who can hesitate?

Of how much value the Indians themselves regard the schools, may be inferred from the fact that the expense of

maintaining them is shared with us by appropriations voluntarily made out of their annuities. The cost we incur is about eight thousand dollars, and for the regular work about twelve thousand more. Add to this an equal sum for missions to the slaves in our own States, some eight thousand dollars for the German missions, half as much to assist the work in the weaker parts of Arkansas and Florida, and five thousand dollars to East and West Texas, and you have what is considered a moderate estimate of the annual cost of the missions which now depend on us for support. Will you not furnish it? What is the sum of fifty or even sixty thousand dollars to a membership of near half a million, having a willing mind.

We have considered with careful deliberation, what system might prove most convenient for collecting your liberality, and have concluded that it is best, at least for the present, to adopt no changes, farther than is necessary to conform to our Church organization. If, however, any should think our system defective, we would exhort such to supply the deficiency by greater diligence. We cannot at present risk an experiment. There must be no delay. The central society will lose no time to organize on the plan adopted, and elect a General Treasurer, to reside at Louisville, and Assistant Treasurers at Charleston and New Orleans. Meanwhile, the preachers, every where within our bounds, should be actively employed in procuring contributions. We repeat, there must be no delay, no holding back, no waiting for one another, no postponing the matter to a convenient season. We desire that every one should receive this letter as summoning him to begin, not by and by, not to-morrow, not the next hour, but with the paper in his hand. Read it to those about you—in the societies—in the congregations; and add what shall strike you to promote the cause. And may God, whom we serve in the gospel of his Son, send now prosperity.

Signed in behalf of the Convention.

JAMES O. ANDREW, Pres't.

THOMAS O. SUMMERS, Sec'y.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

May 14th, 1845.

WILLIAM CAPERS, Ch'n.

On motion of Thomas Crowder, the thanks of the Convention, by a rising vote, were given to the citizens of Louisville, for defraying the expenses incurred by Bishops Soule and Andrew in attending the Convention, and by printing and other incidentals incurred during the session.

On motion of John Early, the Convention adjourned to meet again this afternoon at 3 o'clock,—Bishop Andrew pronouncing the benediction.

SATURDAY AFTERNOON, MAY 17.

Convention met. Bishop Andrew in the chair. Opened with prayer by Francis Wilson, of the Texas Conference.—The Minutes were read and approved.

The Committee on Finance reported the following resolution, which, on motion of Dr. William Capers, was adopted:—

Resolved, That the family expenses of the Bishops be equally divided among the fifteen Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and paid in the same manner that their quarterage and traveling expenses are now paid.

JOHN EARLY, Ch'n.

The Committee on Education then made their report, which was accepted, and the following resolution adopted:—

Resolved, That this Convention recommend to the several Annual Conferences here represented, at their next session, to collect all the material facts connected with the Institutions of learning under their control, respectively, and forward the same by their delegates to the next General Conference.

GEORGE F. PIERCE, Ch'n.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE BOOK CONCERN AND PERIODICALS.

The committee to whom was referred the subject of a Book Concern and Periodicals, after taking the subject into consideration, beg leave to report,—

Your committee take great pleasure in saying to this Convention, that quite a number of *memorials* and *petitions*, together with kind and liberal offers of pecuniary aid, have come into our hands. From the city of Memphis we have received a very flattering proposal, consisting in a large brick building, formerly occupied as a Tavern, which is said to have cost some \$30,000, (though its present value we would not attempt to estimate) together with the expressed wish and desire of a large number of the citizens of the city and neighborhood, that our contemplated Book Concern should be located at that place; pledging themselves to aid and assist the enterprise to the utmost of their ability.

We have also received several petitions from the citizens of this city (Louisville) praying its location here, setting forth the claims of this place to your consideration, and further assuring us that should the Book Concern be established here, that a considerable amount of funds *can* and *will* be raised in aid of such establishment. We have also been favored with a memorial from the city of Nashville, setting forth the claims of that city as every way suitable for such an establishment. St. Louis, also, has been presented to your committee as anx-

ious for the location of said Concern there, and as in every way eligible for the same. While your committee are of the opinion that any one of the abovementioned cities are worthy of such an establishment, and rejoice to learn that our friends in the South feel so deep an interest in this great auxiliary in promoting the cause of God and the best interests of mankind; yet it is the opinion of your committee, that as there will be a General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, in Petersburg, next May—vested with full power to establish a Book Concern, and as further developments may yet be made with respect to the most eligible point within our bounds to locate such an establishment;

1. *Resolved, therefore,* That while we consider a Book Concern as indispensable to the prosperity of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, yet we deem the establishment of one at this time *premature*; nevertheless, we recommend the appointment of two Book Agents, whose duty shall be to receive propositions for the location of the Book Concern, and also receive moneys and contributions for building up the same, and report to the General Conference to be held at Petersburg next May.

2. *Resolved,* That we recommend to the ministers and members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, to continue for the present to patronize the Book Concerns at New York and Cincinnati.

3. *Resolved,* That we recommend to our friends, generally, that they patronize our Periodicals, viz: South-Western Christian Advocate, Southern Christian Advocate, and Richmond Christian Advocate, as every way worthy of our support.

A. L. P. GREEN, Ch'n.

John Early, of the Virginia Conference, and John B. McFerrin, of the Tennessee Conference, were unanimously elected the Book Agents provided for in the first resolution of the foregoing report.

A communication from James P. Shaffner, was received and referred to the Committee on the Book Concern and Periodicals.

On motion of John Early, the Convention adjourned, with the benediction by the Bishop.

MONDAY MORNING, MAY 19.

Convention met. Bishop Soule in the chair. The usual devotions were conducted by Jacob Custer of the Arkansas Conference. The Minutes were read and approved.

John Harrell, of the Arkansas Conference, and Robert Paine, of the Tennessee Conference, obtained leave to go home, when they may find it necessary.

The Book Concern and Periodical Committee made an additional report, which was adopted, as follows:—

The committee to whom was referred the request of J. P. Shaffner, Esq., which contemplates the getting up of a publication of the acts of this Convention, together with the speeches which have been delivered on the occasion, having taken the subject into consideration, beg leave to submit to the Convention their views with regard to this matter.

The great difficulty there is, at present, of obtaining a faithful and correct history of the Methodist Episcopal Church, in America, has no doubt often occurred to every member of this body, and notwithstanding such a work has been attempted, yet it is evident to every one, that it is an utter failure. This has no doubt grown out of the very nature of things, and does not necessarily attach blame to any one. Although our fathers in the ministry were generally men of sound minds and enlarged views, having a correct knowledge of the Holy Scriptures and plan of salvation by faith—men of deep piety and great usefulness—yet there were but few writers among them, and even those who might be called ripe scholars and able preachers, far the greater part have passed away, leaving their names embalmed in the memory of the Church, but no manuscripts with which to enlighten following generations with regard to the true history of our Church; and even those of them who wrote at all, confined themselves principally to their own private journals or sectional questions. No individual has collected and kept together the facts which came up from time to time in our progress, so as to furnish the Church and the world with anything like a correct history of Methodism. All this may be accounted for from the following facts:—in the first place, their fields of labor were very extensive, and between traveling, preaching and pastoral duties, their time and strength were taxed to their utmost. Add to this, that for a considerable time we had no public journals of our own, and access to the world through literary or political journals was very difficult, so that in all probability much of what little was written has been left in the hands of friends who have neglected it, and it long since has become defaced, and being condemned as worthless, has passed away.

But we rejoice to be able to say to you, beloved brethren, that our situation is very different from that of our fathers—*now*, almost every journal is ready to throw open its columns to us. We have writers, and printers, and periodicals, and *book-makers* of our own, and should generations to come fail to receive from us a faithful account of what we have done, they could not plead such an apology for us, as we have to offer for our fathers, but would be compelled to say that we wilfully neglected a known duty.

Your committee would further state, that we would not attempt to disguise the fact, that the movements of the Methodist Episcopal Church, both North and South, are at this time characterized by facts and circumstances, which will and must be referred to by generations yet unborn, as an important epoch in our history, and will stand paramount among the records of our beloved Church, until the Trump of God shall awake the dead.

A failure, therefore, on our part, as a Convention, to furnish posterity with a correct account of our acts and doings in the organization of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, together with the facts which led to the establishing of the same, would be, in the opinion of your committee, a criminal neglect of duty; and your committee would further state, that they not only consider this a duty in view of posterity, but is due to the Church which lies near our hearts, and to our country, of which we are *proud*, that the *truth*, the *whole truth*, and *nothing but the truth*, should be made public—not a matter of record only, but also of history. The necessity of this course is the more apparent at present, from the fact that our acts and doings, and our words in debate, are misrepresented, while attempts have been made to create before the public mind false issues.

Your committee believe further, that all the important facts and circumstances connected with our separate organization, can now be obtained, compiled, and put into a state of preservation; but should this Convention adjourn without taking some measure to secure this object, that it cannot be done at any future period to the same degree of perfection; and as we do nothing in a corner, but wish the Church and the world at large to know what we have done, and our reasons for so acting; therefore,

1. *Resolved*, That the editor or editors of the South-western Christian Advocate, with A. L. P. Green, F. E. Pitts, and John W. Hanner, be appointed a committee, to be entitled the Publishing Committee, whose duty it shall be to compile and publish a *work or book*, which shall be called *The History of the Organization of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South*.

2. *Resolved*, That said work shall contain a full account of the acts and doings of the late General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, in the cases of Rev. James Osgood Andrew, one of the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and the Rev. F. A. Harding of the Baltimore Conference, together with the speeches in the abovementioned cases.

2. The Protest of the minority against the proceedings of the Conference, in the cases mentioned above.

3. The Declaration of the delegates from those Conferences within the bounds of the slave-holding States.

4. The Address of Bishops Soule and Andrew before said Conference.

5. The Plan of Division by the Committee of Nine.

6. The Address of the Southern Delegates to the Church in the South.

7. Action of each and all the Annual Conferences in the bounds of the Southern Organization, on the subject of division, or a separate Southern Organization, together with the vote of each Conference on their respective resolutions.

8. The Address of Bishops Soule and Andrew before this Convention,—the manuscript to be furnished by themselves.

9. The acts and doings of this Convention, together with the speeches which have been delivered.

3. *Resolved further*, That the following brethren, members of this body, be, and they are hereby requested and expected to furnish the Publishing Committee, within one *month* from this time (or date) a manuscript copy of their speeches before this Convention, viz:—

Drs. Winans, Capers and Smith, Rev. John Early, Dr. Pierce, Rev. G. F. Pierce, Drs. Longstreet and Paine, Rev. T. Crowder, Rev. H. H. Kavanaugh, Rev. A. Monroe, Rev. Wm. Patton, Rev. Joseph Boyle, Rev. Wm. McMahon, Rev. F. E. Pitts, Rev. Wm. Gunn, Rev. J. C. Harrison, and Rev. S. Dunwody.

The Committee of Publication shall also be at liberty to publish such other speeches as may have been reported with sufficient correctness to justify their publication.

4. *Resolved further*, That the Journals of the Convention, with all memorials, petitions, reports, and papers, be placed, for the present, in the hands of the Publishing Committee, to enable them to compile the contemplated work.

5. *Resolved*, That Dr. William Capers and William M. Wightman be appointed to address a Circular Letter, in the form of a Pastoral Address, to the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and said letter shall form a portion of the contemplated work.

6. *Resolved*, That should any thing which is not referred to in this report, occur to the Publishing Committee, which, in their opinion, is of interest, and properly belonging to the contemplated work, they shall be at liberty to use such matter.

7. *Resolved*, That the establishment of the South-western Christian Advocate shall incur, for the present, the cost of publication, but shall have the first claim in the sale of the Book, until the money expended in the publication is refunded; after which, the profits of the work shall belong to the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. All of which is respectfully submitted.

A. L. P. GREEN, Ch'n.

The report of the Committee on Organization was then taken up and adopted.

YEAS.—Bascom, Stevenson, Kavanaugh, Crouch, Gunn, Brush, King, James, Ralston, Monroe, J. Green, Glanville, Browning, Patton, Linn, Boyle, Johnson, Catlett, Stringfield, Stevens, Sullins, Fulton, Paine, McFerrin, A. L. P. Green, Pitts, Driskill, Hanner, Boucher, Maddin, Andrews, Bryant, Leigh, Blake, Carson, Doub, Brame, Brock, Harris, McMahon, Joyner, Davidson, McAlister, Smith, Truslow, Custer, Early, Crowder, W. A. Smith, Lee, Penn, Doggett, Cowles, Dibrell, Campbell, Jones, Drake, Watkins, Winans, Fowler, Wilson, Alexander, Hamilton, Boring, T. H. Capers, Levert, Calloway, Summers, Garrett, L. Pierce, Evans, Glenn, Anthony, Longstreet, J. Boring, Payne, G. F. Pierce, Samford, W. Capers, Wightman, Walker, Dunwody, English, S. W. Capers, W. Smith, Boyd, P. P. Smith, Benning, Peery, Cumming—90.

NAYS.—Taylor and Harrison—2.

ABSENT.—McCown, Ferguson, Harrell, Rogers, Speer—5.

The Committee on Organization then made an additional report, as follows:—

The Committee on Organization beg respectfully to report the following resolutions for adoption by the Convention:

1. *Resolved*, That Bishops Soule and Andrew be, and they are hereby respectfully and cordially requested by this Convention, to unite with and become regular and constitutional Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, upon the basis of the plan of separation adopted by the late General Conference.

2 *Resolved*, That should any portion of an Annual Conference on the line of separation, not represented in this Convention, adhere to the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, according to the plan of separation adopted at the late General Conference, and elect delegates to the General Conference of the Church in 1846, upon the basis of representation adopted by this Convention, they shall be accredited as members of the General Conference.

3. *Resolved*, That a committee of three be appointed, whose duty it shall be to prepare and report to the General Conference of 1846, a revised copy of the present Discipline, with such changes as are necessary to conform it to the Organization of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. Respectfully submitted.

JOHN EARLY, Ch'n.

The first resolution was then adopted:

YEAS.—Bascom, Stevenson, Kavanaugh, Crouch, Gunn, Taylor, Brush, Harrison, King, James, Ralston, Monroe, J. Green, Glanville, Browning, Patton, Linn, Boyle, Johnson,

Catlett, Stringfield, Stevens, Sullins, Fulton, Paine, McFerrin, A. L. P. Green, Pitts, Driskill, Hanner, Boucher, Maddin, Andrews, Bryant, Leigh, Blake, Carson, Doub, Brame, Brock, Harris, McMahon, Joyner, Davidson, McAlister, T. Smith, Truslow, Custer, Early, Crowder, W. A. Smith, Lee, Penn, Doggett, Cowles, Dibrell, Campbell, Jones, Drake, Watkins, Winans, Fowler, Wilson, Alexander, Hamilton, Boring, Capers, Levert, Calloway, Summers, Garrett, L. Pierce, Evans, Glenn, Anthony, Longstreet, J. Boring, Payne, Pierce, Samford, W. Capers, Wightman, Walker, Dunwody, English, S. W. Capers, W. Smith, Boyd, P. P. Smith, Benning, Peery, Cumming—95.

NAYS.—None.

ABSENT.—Burr H. McCown, Ferguson, Harrell, Rogers, Speer.—5.

The following documents were received from Bishops Soule and Andrew, in answer to the invitation contained in this resolution:—

“DEAR BRETHREN,—I feel myself bound in good faith, to carry out the official plan of Episcopal Visitations as settled by the Bishops in New York, and published in the official papers of the Church, until the session of the first General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South; from which time it would be necessary that the plan should be so changed as to be accommodated to the jurisdiction of the two distinct General Conferences. That when such Southern General Conference shall be held, I shall feel myself fully authorized by the plan of separation, adopted by General Conference of 1844, to unite myself with the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and if received by the General Conference of said Church, to exercise the functions of the Episcopal Office within the jurisdiction of said General Conference.

“JOSHUA SOULE.

“LOUISVILLE, Ky., May 19, 1845.”

“DEAR BRETHREN,—I decidedly approve the course which the Convention has taken in establishing the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, believing as I do most sincerely, that it will tend, under God's blessing, to the wider spread and more efficient propagation of the gospel of the grace of God. I accept the invitation of the Convention to act as one of the superintendents of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and pledge myself, in humble dependence upon Divine grace, to use my best efforts to promote the cause of God in the interesting and extensive field of labor assigned me.

"May the blessing of God be upon us mutually, in our laborious field of action, and finally, may we all, with our several charges, be gathered to the home of God and the good in heaven.

Affectionately your brother and

"Fellow-laborer,

"LOUISVILLE, May, 1845.

JAMES O. ANDREW."

On motion of William Gunn the Convention adjourned to meet again this afternoon, at 3 o'clock—the Bishop pronouncing the benediction.

MONDAY AFTERNOON, MAY 19.

Convention met. Bishop Soule in the chair. The usual devotions were conducted by Dr. Lovick Pierce. The Minutes were read and approved.

The additional report of the Committee on Organization was taken up, and the Resolution requiring the vote to be taken by yeas and nays suspended.

The second and third resolutions of the report were then unanimously adopted.

The Committee on Education made an additional report, which was adopted, and the Secretary was instructed to furnish a copy of the same to the President of Transylvania University. It is as follows:—

The Committee on Education beg leave to offer the following additional report:—

Transylvania University, though not now strictly under the control of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, has special claims on our attention, in view of its present and perspective relations. A connection has subsisted between that Institution and the Kentucky Annual Conference for nearly three years; during which period that Conference has enjoyed the control of the academical department and has supplied it with professors. The property is valuable—the endowment large, and the Institution in a highly prosperous condition, having about two hundred and seventy students, and employing eight professors. The control of this department of the University is now tendered by the Trustees to the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, through this Convention, on terms entirely liberal and advantageous to the Church. That the Church should avail itself of a proposition so well calculated to promote her welfare and extend her sphere of useful influence, can hardly be doubted; but as the power of this body in its conventional capacity to act conclusively in the premises is questionable, the consummation of the proposed connexion must of necessity be deferred until the meeting of the Gene-

ral Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, in May, 1846. It is, however, in the mean time, expedient to give such assurances as are not inconsistent with our Conventional character, of a just appreciation of the liberal proposition of the Trustees, and of the intention of the Church to consummate in good faith the proposed connexion, so soon as it may be practicable to do so; therefore,

Resolved, 1. That the members of this Convention highly appreciate the offer made to the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, by the Trustees of Transylvania University, of the control of the academical department of said Institution, and that we will use our influence, so far as it may be done, consistently with obligations to kindred Institutions under the care of our Conferences, to promote its patronage and general prosperity.

Resolved, 2. That it be recommended to the Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, to instruct their delegates in the General Conference of 1846, to take such action as will consummate the proposed connexion between the Trustees of Transylvania University and the General Conference, and adopt it as the University of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South.

Resolved, 3. That it is the judgment of the members of this Convention, that by fair construction of the terms and conditions of the negotiation pending between the Trustees of Transylvania University and the Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, it will be competent and proper for the present Curators of the University, in behalf of the Church, to fill any vacancies in their own Board, until the meeting of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, in May, 1846. GEORGE F. PIERCE, Ch'n.

The committee appointed to prepare a Pastoral Address, submitted the following, which was adopted:—

To the ministers of the several Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and to all the brethren of their pastoral oversight, the Convention of said Annual Conferences address this letter, with Christian salutation.

We gratefully regard it matter of congratulation, beloved brethren, for which our thanks should be offered at the throne of grace, that we have been enabled to conduct the business confided to us by you, with great harmony, and except, perhaps, some inconsiderable shades of difference on points of minor import, with unexampled unanimity. Our agreement on all questions of importance, has probably been as perfect as the weakness of human knowledge might allow, or reason should require.

For full information of all that we have done, we refer you to the journal of our proceedings, and the documents which accompany it; particularly the Reports of the Committees on Organization, and on Missions. This latter interest we have made the subject of a special letter, wishing to bring it immediately to the notice of all our Churches and congregations, (to whom we have requested the letter might be read,) to engage their instant liberality.

We made it a point of early inquiry, in the course of our proceedings, to ascertain with what unanimity the Annual Conferences represented by us, and the entire body of the ministry and membership within their general bounds, were known to have concurred in sustaining the declaration of the Southern delegates in the late General Conference, and in approving of the plan provided by that Conference for our being constituted a distinct ecclesiastical connection, separate from the North. The Committee on Organization, being composed of two members from each of the Annual Conferences, was furnished with ample means of obtaining satisfactory information. The members of the committee held meetings with their several delegations apart, and on a comparison of their several reports carefully made, it was found, that both as to the members of the Annual Conferences, and the local ministry and membership of our entire territory, the declaration had been sustained, and a separate organization called for, by as great a majority as *ninety-five to five*. Nor did it appear that *even five in a hundred* were disposed to array themselves against their brethren, whose interests were identical with their own, but that part were Northern brethren sojourning in our borders, and part were dwelling in sections of the country where the questions involved did not materially concern their Christian privileges, or those of the slaves among them. So great appears to have been the unanimity of opinion prevailing, both among the pastors and the people, as to the urgent necessity of the great measure which we were deputed to effect, by organizing on the basis of the discipline, and the plan provided by the late General Conference, THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, SOUTH.

That on so grave a question, concerning interests so sacred, and affecting so numerous a people, spread over the vast extent of the country from Missouri to the Atlantic Ocean, and from Virginia to Texas, there should be found some who dissent, is what we could not but expect. But that the number dissenting should have been so small, compared to the number of those who have required us to act, is, at least to our minds, conclusive proof of the absolute necessity of this action, as affording the only means left in our power to preserve the

Church in the more Southern States from hopeless ruin. Indeed the action of the late General Conference, without the intervention of the declaration of the Southern delegates, and the provisional plan for a separate Southern connection, must have immediately broken up all our missions to the people of color, and subjected their classes in most of the Southern circuits to ruinous deprivations. Of this, the evidence has been unquestionable. And it must appear to you, brethren, that for whatever reason so great an evil was threatened for a cause which the Southern delegates did nothing to produce, but resisted in the General Conference, *that* evil could not fail of being inflicted with redoubled violence, and to a still greater extent, if we, having a platform legally furnished for a separate organization, should hesitate a moment to avail ourselves of it. It would be, in effect, to put ourselves, in relation to the laws and policy of the Southern people, in the same position which was so injuriously offensive in our Northern brethren, while it could not be plead in extenuation of the fault, that we were Northern men, and ignorant of the state of affairs at the South. Into such a position we could not possibly put ourselves; nor can we think that reasonable men would require us to do so.

We avow, brethren, and we do it with the greatest solemnity, that while we have thus been laid under the imperative force of an absolute necessity to organize the Southern and South-western Conferences into an independent ecclesiastical connection, whose jurisdiction shall be exclusive of all interference on the part of the North, we do not withdraw from the true Christian and Catholic pale of the Methodist Episcopal Church. And that whilst we have complained, with grievous cause, of the power of the majority of the General Conference, as that power has been construed and exercised, we have not complained, and have no complaint, against the Church in itself. The General Conference, or a majority thereof, is not the Church. Nor is it possible that that should be the Methodist Episcopal Church, which withdraws the ministry of the gospel from the poor, and turns her aside from her calling of God "to spread scripture holiness over these lands," in order to fulfill some other errand, no matter what. We could not be Methodists at all, as we have been taught what Methodism is, if with our knowledge of its nature, its aim, its constitution, its discipline, and of the ruin inevitable to the work of the ministry in most of the Southern States, if not in all of them, should we still cleave to a Northern jurisdiction; we nevertheless could not be persuaded to yield the gospel for a jurisdictional affinity with brethren, who, we believe in our hearts, cannot govern us without great injury to the cause of

Christ in most parts of our work. If we err, it is the spirit of Methodism which prompts us to the error. We "call God for a record," that, as far as we know our hearts, we intend nothing, we desire nothing, we do nothing, having any other object or aim but that the gospel may be preached, without let or hindrance, in all parts of our country, and especially to the poor. There is nothing belonging of right to the Church—her doctrines, her discipline, her economy, her usages, her efficiency, which we do not cherish in our inmost hearts. It is not the Church, not any thing proper to the Church, in her character as Christ's body, and consecrated to the promotion of his cause in the earth, which we would disown, or depart from, or oppose; but only such a position *in* the Church as some of her sons would force us into, antagonistic to her principles, her policy, and her calling of God. Nor yet can we be charged with any factious or schismatic opposition to the General Conference, for we have done nothing, and mean to do nothing, not authorized by express enactment of that body, in view of the very emergency which compels our action.

It had been too much to expect, considering the weakness of man, that suddenly roused to resistance as the Southern Churches were, by the unlooked for action in the cases of Cishop Andrew and brother Harding, there should not in some instances have escaped expressions of resentment and unkindness. Or that, put to the defence of the majority of the General Conference, where the evil complained of was so serious, the advocates of that majority should not sometimes have expressed themselves in terms which seemed harsh and unjust. We deeply deplore it, and pray that for the time to come, such exhibitions of a mortifying frailty may give place to Christian moderation. We invoke the spirit of peace and holiness. That brother shall be esteemed as deserving best, who shall do most for the promotion of peace. Surely this is a time of all others, in our day, when we should seek and pursue peace. A continuance of strife between North and South, must prove prejudicial on both sides. The separation is made—formally, legally made—and let peace ensue. In Christ's name let there be peace. Whatever is needful to be done, or worth the doing, may be done in peace. We especially exhort brethren of the border Conferences and societies, to forbear each other in love, and labor after peace. Let every one abide by the law of the General Conference with respect to our bounds, and choose for himself with Christian temper, and permit others to choose without molestation, between North and South. Our chief care should be to maintain "the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace." Methodism preserved in what makes it one the world over—the purity of its doctrines,

the efficiency of its discipline, its unworldliness, its zeal for God, its self-devotion—is of infinitely greater value than a question of boundary, or General Conference jurisdiction merely.

And now, brethren, beseeching you to receive the word of exhortation which we have herein briefly addressed to you, and humbly invoking the blessings of God upon you, according to the riches of his grace in Christ our Lord, praying for you, as we always do, that you may abound in every good work, and confiding in your prayers for us, that we may be found one with you in faith and charity at the appearing of Jesus Christ, we take leave of you, and return from the work which we have now fulfilled, to renew our labors with you and among you in the Lord.

JAMES O. ANDREW, Pres't.

THOMAS O. SUMMERS, Sec'y.

LOUISVILLE, Ky., May 16, 1845.

On motion of Thomas N. Ralston, it was

Resolved, That in the judgment of this Convention, those societies and stations on the border, within the limits of Conferences represented in this Convention, be constructively understood as adhering to the South, unless they see proper to take action on the subject; and in all such cases, we consider the Pastor of the society or station as the proper person to preside in the meeting.

On motion of William A. Smith, it was

Resolved, That the Pastoral Address be printed, and that such border charges or societies as may feel themselves called upon to make an election between the Northern and Southern division of the Church be, and they are hereby, respectfully requested to have the Pastoral Address of this Convention read before the society or the several societies of the charge, before voting on the subject.

Dr. Lovick Pierce presented a document on the Bible cause, which was read, adopted, and ordered to be published.

On motion of Dr. William Capers, it was

Resolved, That we cherish an affectionate sense of the very kind obligations under which we have been laid to our friends of this city, for the Christian hospitality with which we have been entertained at their houses, during the session of this Convention, and that our prayers to God shall not be wanting for their prosperity and spiritual welfare.

Resolved, That we entertain a grateful sense of the liberality of those Churches and Pastors of this city who have invited us to their pulpits, and that we will not fail to remember them as brethren, at the throne of grace.

On motion of Drs. Winans and Bascom, it was

Resolved, That the thanks of this Convention be tendered to Bishops Soule and Andrew, for the able and impartial manner in which they have performed the laborious and responsible duties of the Chair during the session of the Convention.

On motion of Dr. William A. Smith, it was

Resolved, That we hereby tender our thanks to the Rev. Thomas O. Summers, Secretary of this Convention, and to the Rev. Thomas N. Ralston, Assistant Secretary, for their fidelity in the discharge of the laborious duties of their office.

On motion of Whitford Smith, it was

Resolved, That we devoutly acknowledge the superintending Providence of God over this Convention, and rejoice in the harmony which has prevailed in all its deliberations and decisions.

On motion of John Early, John B. McFerrin was instructed to take charge of the Journal and papers of this Convention.

The Minutes were then read and approved, and on motion of John Early, the Convention adjourned. This venerable minister offered a suitable and impressive prayer to the Throne of Grace, the Convention sung an appropriate hymn, and Bishop Soule pronounced the benediction. Thus closed the session.

JOSHUA SOULE, Ch'n.

THOMAS O. SUMMERS, Sec'y.

THOMAS N. RALSTON, As't. Sec'y.

LOUISVILLE, Ky., May 19, 1845.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION.

THE committee appointed to enquire into the propriety and necessity of a separate organization of the Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, in the slaveholding States, for the purpose of a separate General Conference connexion and jurisdiction, within the limits of said States and Conferences, having had the entire subject under careful and patient consideration, together with the numerous petitions, instructions, resolutions, and propositions for adjustment and compromise, referred to them by the Convention—offer the following as their

REPORT:

In view of the extent to which the great questions in controversy, between the North and the South of the Methodist Episcopal Church, have been discussed, and by consequence must be understood by the parties more immediately interested: it has not been deemed necessary by the committee to enter

into any formal or elaborate examination of the general subject, beyond a plain and comprehensive statement of the facts and principles involved, which may place it in the power of all concerned, to do justice to the convictions and motives of the Southern portion of the Church, in resisting the action of the late General Conference on the subject of slavery, and its unconstitutional assumption of right and power in other respects; and also presenting, in a form as brief and lucid as possible, some of the principal grounds of action, had in view by the South, in favoring the provisional plan of separation, adopted by the General Conference at its last session.

On the subject of the legitimate right, and the full and proper authority of the Convention to institute, determine, and finally act upon the enquiry, referred to the committee, to deliberate and report upon, the committee entertain no doubt whatever. Apart from every other consideration, which might be brought to bear upon the question, the General Conference of 1844, in the plan of jurisdictional separation adopted by that body, gave full and express authority to "the Annual Conferences in the slaveholding States," to judge of the propriety, and decide upon the necessity of organizing a "separate ecclesiastical connexion," in the South. And not only did the General Conference invest this right in "the Annual Conferences in the slaveholding States," without limitation or reserve, as to the *extent* of the investment, and *exclusively* with regard to every other division of the Church, and all other branches or powers of the government, but left the method of official determination and the mode of action, in the exercise or assertion of the right, to the free and untrammelled discretion of the Conferences interested. These Conferences, thus accredited by the General Conference, to judge and act for themselves, confided the right and trust of decision and action, in the premises, to delegates regularly chosen by these bodies respectively, upon a uniform principle and fixed ratio of representation, previously agreed upon by each, in constitutional session, and directed them to meet in general Convention, in the city of Louisville, May, 1845, for this and other purposes, authorized by the General Conference, at the same time and in the same way. All the right and power, therefore, of the General Conference, in any way connected with the important decision in question, were duly and formally transferred to "the Annual Conferences in the slaveholding States," and exclusively invested in them. And as this investment was obviously for the purpose, that such right and power might be exercised by them, in any mode they might prefer, not inconsistent with the terms and conditions of the investment, the delegates thus chosen, one hundred in

number, and representing sixteen Annual Conferences, under commission of the General Conference, here and now assembled in Convention, have not only all the right and power of the General Conference, as transferred to "the Annual Conferences in the slaveholding States," but in addition, all the right and power of necessity inherent in these bodies, as constituent parties, giving birth and power to the General Conference itself, as the common Federal Council of the Church. It follows hence, that for all the purposes specified and understood in this preliminary view of the subject, the Convention possesses all the right and power both of the General Conference and the sixteen "Annual Conferences in the slaveholding States," jointly and severally considered. The ecclesiastical and Conventional right therefore, of this body, to act in the premises, and act conclusively, irrespective of the whole Church—and all its powers of government beside, is clear and undoubted. As the *moral* right, however, to act as proposed, in the General Conference plan of jurisdictional separation, rests upon entirely different grounds, and will perhaps be considered as furnishing the only allowable warrant of action, notwithstanding constitutional right, it may be necessary at least to glance at the grave moral reasons, creating the necessity, the high moral compulsions, by which the Southern Conferences and Church have been impelled to the course of action, which it is the intention of this Report to explain and vindicate, as not only right and reasonable, but indispensable to the character and welfare of Southern Methodism.

The preceding statements and reasoning, present no new principle or form of action in the history of the Church. Numerous instances might be cited, in the constitutional history of Church polity, in which high moral necessity, in the absence of any recognized Conventional right, has furnished the only and yet sufficient warrant for ecclesiastical movements and arrangements, precisely similar in character with that contemplated in the plan of a separate Southern Connection of the Methodist Episcopal Church, adopted by the late General Conference. Wesleyan Methodism, in all its phases and aspects, is a most pertinent illustration of the truth we assume, and the fitness and force of the example must go far to preclude the necessity of any other proof. It was on the specific basis of such necessity, without Conventional right, that the great Wesleyan Connection arose in England. It was upon the same basis, as avowed by Wesley, that the American Connection became separate and independent, and this Connection again avows the same principle of action, in the separation and establishment of a Methodist Episcopal Church in Canada, whose organization took place by permission and di-

rection of the same authority, under which this Convention is now acting for a similar purpose.

Should it appear in the premises of the action proposed, that a high, moral, and religious duty is devolved upon the ministry and membership of the Methodist Episcopal Church, in the South—devolved upon us by the Great Head of the Church, and the Providential appointments of our social condition, which we cannot neglect without infidelity to a high moral trust, but which we cannot fulfil in connexional union with the Northern portion of the Church, under the same General Conference jurisdiction, owing to causes connected with the civil institutions of the country, and beyond the control of the Church, *then* a strong moral necessity is laid upon us, which assumes the commanding character of a positive duty, under sanction of Divine right, to dissolve the ties and bonds of a single General Conference jurisdiction, and in its place substitute one in the South, which will not obstruct us in the performance of duty, or prevent us from accomplishing the great objects of the Christian ministry and Church organization. From a careful survey of the entire field of facts and their relations—the whole range of cause and effect, as connected with the subject-matter of this report, it is confidently believed that the great warrant of *moral necessity*, not less than unquestionable ecclesiastical right, fully justifies this Convention in the position they are about to take, as a separate organic division of the Methodist Episcopal Church, by authority of its chief synod, “the delegates of all the several Annual Conferences in General Conference assembled.” One of the two main issues, which have decided the action of the Southern Conferences, relates, as all know, to the assumed right of the Church to control the question of slavery, by means of the ordinary and fluctuating provisions of Church legislation, without reference to the superior control of State policy and civil law.—From all the evidence accessible in the case, the great masses of the ministry and membership of the Methodist Episcopal Church, North and South, present an irreconcilable opposition of conviction and feeling on the subject of slavery, so far as relates to the rights of the Church to interfere with the question—the one claiming unlimited right of interference to the full extent the Church may, at any time or from any cause, be concerned, and the other resisting alike the assumption or exercise of any such right, because, in nearly all the slaveholding States, such a course of action must bring the Church in direct conflict with the civil authority, to which the Church has pledged subjection and support in the most solemn and explicit forms, and from the obligations of which she cannot retreat without dishonoring her own laws, and the neglect and viola-

tion of some of the plain and most imperative requirements of Christianity. Under such circumstances of disagreement—in such a state of adverse conviction and feeling on the part of the North and South of the Church, it is believed that the two great sections of the Church, thus situated, in relation to each other by causes beyond the control of either party, cannot remain together and successfully prosecute the high and common aims of the Christian ministry and Church organization, under the same General Conference jurisdiction. The manifest want of uniformity of opinion and harmony of co-operation, must always lead, as heretofore, to struggles and results directly inconsistent with the original intention of the Church, in establishing a common jurisdiction, to control all its general interests. And should it appear that, by a division and future duality of such jurisdiction as authorized by the late General Conference, the original purposes of the Church can better be accomplished, or rather, that they can be accomplished in no other way, how can the true and proper unity of the Church be maintained except by yielding to the necessity, and having a separate General Conference jurisdiction for each division? By the Southern portion of the Church generally, slavery is regarded as strictly a civil institution exclusively in custody of the civil power, and as a regulation of State beyond the reach of Church interference or control, except as civil law and right may be infringed by ecclesiastical assumption. By the Northern portion of the Church, individuals are held responsible for the alleged *injustice* and *evil* of relations and rights, created and protected by the organic and municipal laws of the Government and country, and which relations and rights, in more than two thirds of the slaveholding States, are not under individual control in any sense or to any extent.

Both portions of the Church are presumed to act from principle and conviction, and cannot, therefore, recede; and *how*, under *such* circumstances, is it possible to prevent the most fearful disunion, with all the attendant evils of contention and strife, except by allowing each section a separate and independent jurisdiction, the same in character and purpose with the one to which both have hitherto been subject. What fact, truth, or principle, not merely of human origin, and therefore of doubtful authority, can be urged, as interposing any reasonable obstacle to a change of jurisdiction, merely *modal* in character, and simply designed to adapt a single principle of Church government, not pretended to be of divine obligation or scripture origin, to the character and features of the civil government of the country? Nothing essential to Church organization—nothing essentially distinctive of Methodism—even

American Methodism, is proposed to be disturbed or even touched, by the arrangement. It is a simple division of general jurisdiction, for strong moral reasons, arising out of the civil relations and position of the parties, intended to accomplish for both, what it is demonstrated by experiment, cannot be accomplished by one common jurisdiction, as now constituted, and should therefore, under the stress of such moral necessity, be attempted in some other way.

The question of slavery, more or less intimately interwoven with the interests and destiny of nine millions of human beings, in the United States, is certainly of sufficient importance, coming up as it has, in the recent history of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and as it does in the deliberations of this Convention, to authorize any merely *modal* or even organic changes in the government of the Church, should it appear obvious that the original and avowed purposes of the Church will be more effectively secured and promoted by the change proposed, than by continuing the present or former system. The evidence before the committee, establishes the fact in the clearest manner possible, that throughout the Southern Conferences, the ministry and membership of the Church, amounting to nearly 500,000, in the proportion of about ninety-five in the hundred, deem a division of jurisdiction indispensable to the welfare of the Church, in the Southern and South-western Conferences of the slaveholding States; and this fact alone, must go far to establish the *right*, while it demonstrates the *necessity* of the separate jurisdiction, contemplated in the plan of the General Conference and adopted by that body in view of such necessity, as likely to exist. The interests of State, civil law, and public opinion, in the South, imperiously require, that the Southern portion of the Church shall have no part in the *discussion* and agitation of this subject in the chief councils of the Church. In this opinion, nearly universal in the South, we *concur*.

Christ and his Apostles—Christianity and its inspired and early teachers, found slavery in its most offensive and aggravated forms, as a civil institution, diffused and existing throughout nearly the entire field of their ministrations and influence; and yet, in the New Testament and earlier records of the Church, we have no legislation—no interference—no denunciation with regard to it, not even remonstrance against it. They found it wrought up and vitally intermingled with the whole machinery of civil government and order of society—so implicated with “the powers that be,” that infinite wisdom, and the early pastoral guides of the Church, saw just reason why the Church should not interfere beyond a plain and urgent enforcement of the various duties growing out of the peculiar relation of master and slave, leaving *the relation* itself, as a

civil arrangement, untouched and unaffected, except so far as it seems obviously to have been the Divine purpose to remove every form and degree of wrong and evil connected with the institutions of human government, by a faithful inculcation of the doctrines and duties of Christianity, without meddling in any way with the civil polity of the countries into which it was introduced. A course precisely similar to this, the example of which should have been more attractive, was pursued by the great founder of Methodism, in all slaveholding countries in which he established societies. Mr. Wesley never deemed it proper to have any rule, law, or regulation on the subject of slavery, either in the United States, the West Indies, or elsewhere. The effects of the early and unfortunate attempts of the Methodist Church to meddle and interfere, in the *legislation* and *practice* of government and discipline, with the institution of slavery in the United States, are too well known to require comment. Among the more immediate results of this shortsighted, disastrous imprudence, especially from 1780 to 1804, may be mentioned the watchful jealousy of civil government, and the loss of public confidence throughout a very large and influential portion of the whole Southern community. These, and similar developments, led the Church, by the most careful and considerate steps, to the adoption, gradually, of a medium compromise course of legislation on the subject, until the law of slavery, as it now exists in the *letter* of discipline, became, by the last material act of legislation in 1816, the great compromise bond of union between the North and the South on the subject of slavery. The whole law of the Church, all there is in the statute-book to govern North and South on this subject, is the following: *First*: The general rule, which simply prohibits "the buying or selling of men, women, or children, with an *intention to enslave them.*" *Second*: "No slaveholder shall be eligible to any official station in our Church hereafter, where the laws of the State in which he lives admit of emancipation, and permit the liberated slave to enjoy freedom. When any traveling preacher becomes an owner of a slave, or slaves, by any means, he shall forfeit his ministerial character in our Church, unless he execute, if it be practicable, a legal emancipation of such slaves, conformably to the laws of the State in which he lives."

Here is the law, the *whole*, the *only* law of the Church, containing first, a *prohibition*, and second a *grant*. The prohibition is, that no member or minister of the Church, is allowed to purchase or sell a human being, who is to be *enslaved*, or *reduced to a state of slavery*, by such purchase or sale. And further, that no minister, in *any of the grades* of ministerial office, or other person, having official standing in the Church,

can, if he be the owner of a slave, be allowed to sustain such official relation to the Church, unless he shall legally provide for the emancipation of such slave or slaves, if the laws of the State in which he lives will admit of legal emancipation, and permit the liberated slave to enjoy freedom. Such is the plain *prohibition* of law, binding upon all. The *grant* of the law, however, is equally plain and unquestionable. It is, that persons *may* purchase or sell men, women, or children, provided such purchase or sale does not involve the fact or intention of enslaving them, or of *reducing the subjects* of such purchase or sale *to a state of slavery*. The intention of the law no doubt is, that this may be done from motives of humanity, and not by any means for the purpose of gain. But further, the law distinctly provides, that every minister, *in whatever grade of office*, and every person having *official standing of any kind*, in the Methodist Episcopal Church, being the owner or owners of slave property, shall be protected against any forfeiture of right, on this account, where the laws of the State do not admit of legal emancipation, and allow the liberated slave to enjoy freedom in the State in which he is emancipated. Here is the plain *grant of law* to which we allude. From the first agitation of the subject of slavery in the Church, the Northern portion of it has been disposed to insist upon further *prohibitory* enactments. The South, meanwhile, has always shown itself ready to go as far, by way of prohibition, as the law in question implies, but has uniformly resisted any attempt to impair Southern rights under protection of the grant of law to which we have asked attention. Under such circumstances of disagreement and difficulty, the conventional and legislative adjustment of the question, as found in the General Rule, but especially the tenth section of the discipline, was brought about, and has always been regarded in the South as a great compromise arrangement, without strict adherence to which, the North and the South could not remain together under the same general jurisdiction. That we have not mistaken the character of the law, or misconstrued the intention and purposes of its enactment, at different times, we think entirely demonstrable from the whole history both of the legislation of the Church and the judicial and executive administration of the Government. The full force and bearing of the law, however, were more distinctly brought to view, and authoritatively asserted, by the General Conference of 1840, after the most careful examination of the whole subject, and the judicial determination of that body, connected with the language of the discipline just quoted, gives in still clearer light *the true and only law of the Church* on the subject of slavery. After deciding various other principles and positions incidental to the main question,

the decision is summed up in the following words: "While the general rule (or law) on the subject of slavery, relating to those States whose laws admit of emancipation, and permit the liberated slave to enjoy freedom, should be firmly and constantly enforced, the exception to the general rule (or law) applying to those States where emancipation, as defined above, is *not practicable*, should be recognized and protected with equal firmness and impartiality; therefore—

Resolved by the several Annual Conferences in General Conference assembled, That under the provisional exception of the general rule (or law) of the Church, on the subject of slavery, the simple holding of slaves, or mere ownership of slave property, in States or Territories where the laws do not admit of emancipation and permit the liberated slave to enjoy freedom, constitutes *no legal barrier* to the election or ordination of ministers to the various grades of office known in the ministry of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and cannot, therefore, be considered as operating *any forfeiture* of right, in view of such election and ordination." This decision of the General Conference was not objected to or dissented from by a single member of that body. It was the unanimous voice of the great representative and judicial council of the Church then acting in the character of a high court of appeals for the decision of an important legal question. It will be perceived how strikingly the language of this decision accords with *both* the features of the law of slavery which we have thought it important to notice, the *prohibition* and the *grant* of law in the case; what may *not* be done as the general rule, and at the same time what *may be done*, under the provisional exception to the general law, without forfeiture of right of any kind. It is also worthy of particular notice, that beside the plain assurance of the original law, that where emancipation is not legally practicable, and the emancipated slave allowed to enjoy freedom, or where it is practicable to emancipate but the emancipated slave cannot enjoy freedom, emancipation is not required of any owner of slaves in the Methodist Episcopal Church, from the lowest officer up to the Bishop, but the rights of all thus circumstanced are protected and secured, notwithstanding their connection with slavery. Besides this, the full and elaborate decision of the General Conference as a grave and formal adjudication had upon all the issues involved in the question, published to all who were in or might be disposed to enter the Church, that the law of slavery applied to States where emancipation is impracticable, and the freed slave not allowed to enjoy freedom, this clear and unambiguous decision, by the highest authority of the Church, *leaves* the owner of slaves upon the ground—upon a basis of the most perfect

equality with *other* ministers of the Church, having no connection with slavery. Such, then, is the law; such its construction; such the official and solemn pledge of the Church. And these had, to a great extent, restored the lost confidence and allayed the jealous apprehensions of the South, in relation to the purposes of the Church respecting slavery. There was in the South no disposition to disturb, discuss, or in any way agitate the subject. The law was not objected to or complained of, but was regarded as a settled compromise between the parties, a medium arrangement on the ground of mutual concession, well calculated to secure and promote the best interests of the Church North and South.

That this law, this great compromise conservative arrangement, which had been looked to as the only reliable bond of jurisdictional union between the North and South for nearly half a century, was practically disregarded and abandoned by the last General Conference, in the memorable cases of Harding and Andrew, both by judicial construction and virtual legislation, manifestly inconsistent with its provisions and purposes, and subversive of the great objects of its enactment, has been too fearfully demonstrated by various forms of proof, to require more than a brief notice in this report. The actual position of the Church was suddenly reversed and its long established policy entirely changed. The whole law of the Church and the most important adjudications had upon it, were treated as null and obsolete, and that body proceeded to a claim of right and course of action amounting to a virtual repeal of all law, and new and capricious legislation on the most difficult and delicate question ever introduced into the councils of the Church or named upon its statute book.

By no fair construction of the law of slavery as given above, could the Church be brought in conflict with civil legislation on the subject. It is true, as demanded by the convictions and opinions of the Church, testimony was borne against the evil of slavery, but it was done without conflicting with the polity and laws of any portion of the country. No law, for example, affected the lay-membership of the Church with regard to slaveholding; the Church gave its full permission that the private members of the Church might own and hold slaves at discretion; and the inference is indubitable, that the Church did not consider simple slaveholding *as a moral evil*, personally attaching to the mere fact of being the owner or holder of slaves. The evil charged upon slavery must of necessity have been understood of other aspects of the subject, and could not imply moral obliquity, without impeaching the integrity and virtue of the Church. Moreover, where the laws precluded emancipation, the ministry were subjected to no

disabilities of any kind, and the requirements of the Church, in relation to slavery, were not at least in any thing like direct conflict with civil law. In contravention, however, of the plain and long established law of the Church, the action of the General Conference of 1844, in the well known instances cited, brought the Church into a state of direct and violent antagonism with the civil authority and the rights of citizenship, throughout all the slaveholding States. This was not done by the repeal of existing law, or additional legislation by direct enactment, but in a much more dangerous form, by the simple process of resolution by an irresponsible majority, requiring Southern ministers as slaveholders, in order to Church eligibility and equality of right with non-slaveholding ministers of the Church, to do what cannot be done without a violation of the laws of the States in which they reside, and is not required or contemplated, but expressly excepted and even provided against by the law of the Church.

It will thus appear that the entire action of the General Conference on the subject of slavery, was in direct conflict with the law, both of the Church and the land, and could not have been submitted to by the South, without the most serious detriment to the interests of the Church. The action in the instance of Bishop Andrew, was in the strongest and most exceptionable sense, extra-judicial. It was not pretended that Bishop Andrew had violated any law of the Church; so far from this, the only law applicable to the case, gave, as we have seen, ample and explicit assurance of protection. So to construe law, or so proceed to act without reference to law, as to abstract from it its whole protective power, and deprive it of all its conservative tendencies in the system, is one of the most dangerous forms of legal injustice, and as a principle of action, must be considered as subversive of all order and government. The late General Conference required of Bishop Andrew, the same being equally true in the case of Harding, as the condition of his being acceptable to the Church, the surrender of rights secured to him, both by civil and ecclesiastical law. The purposes of law were contravened and destroyed, and its prerogative and place usurped by mere opinion.

The requisition in the case was not only extra-judicial, being made in the absence of anything like law authorizing the measure, but being made at the same time against law, it was usurpation; and so far as the proceeding complained of is intended to establish a principle of action with regard to the future, it gives to the General Conference all the attributes of a despotism, claiming the right to govern *without, above and against law*. The doctrine avowed at the late General Conference, and practically endorsed by the majority, that that

body may, by simple resolution, advisory, punitive, or declaratory, repeal an existing law in relation to a particular case, leaving it in full force with regard to other cases—or may enact a new and different law, and apply it judicially to the individual case, which led to the enactment, and all in a moment, by a single elevation of the hand, is a position—a doctrine so utterly revolutionary and disorganizing, as to place in jeopardy at once, both the interests and reputation of the Church. The action in the case of Bishop Andrew, not only assumed the character, and usurped the place of law, but was clearly an instance of *ex post facto* legislation, by making that an offence after the act, which was not such before. The conduct charged as an offence, was at the time, and continues to be, under the full protection of a well understood, and standing law of the Church, and yet this conduct was made criminal, and punishable by the retrospective action of the Conference to which we allude. The officially expressed will of the General Conference intended to govern and circumscribe the conduct of Bishop Andrew, without reference to existing law, and indeed contrary to it, was made the rule of action, and he found guilty of its violation, by acts done before he was made acquainted with it. The conduct charged, was in perfect consistency with the law of the Church, and could only be wrought into an offence by an *ex post facto* bearing of the after action of the General Conference.

Bishop Andrew became the owner of slave property, involuntarily, several years before his marriage, and as the *fact*, and not the *extent* of his connection with slavery constituted his offence, it follows, that for a relation in which he was placed by the action of others, and the operation of civil law, and in which, as a citizen of Georgia, he was compelled to remain, or be brought in conflict with the laws of the State, he *was*, in violation of the pledge of public law, as we have shown, arrested and punished by the General Conference. That body by direct requirement, such at least by implication, commanded him to free his slaves, or suffer official degradation. The law of Georgia required him to hold his slaves, or transfer them to be held as such by others, under heavy and painful penalties to master and slave. To avoid ecclesiastical punishment and disability, the Church required him either to leave the State of his residence, or violate its laws. In this way, taking the judicial decision in Harding's case, and the anomalous action in Bishop Andrew's, the Church is placed in most offensive conflict with the civil authority of the State. Can any country or government safely allow the Church to enforce disobedience to civil law, as a Christian duty? If such attempts are made to subordinate the civil interests of the State, to the schemes

and purposes of Church innovation, prompted and sustained by the bigotry and fanaticism of large masses of ignorant and misguided zealots engaged in the conflict in the name of God and conscience, and for the ostensible purposes of religious reform, what can be the stability of civil government, or the hopes of those seeking its protection? And what, we ask, must be the interest of the South, in connection with such movements?

In the instance of slavery in this country, it is but too well known, that such antagonism as is indicated by the preceding facts and developments between the purposes of the Church and the policy of the State, must result in the most disastrous consequences to both. The slavery of the Southern States, can never be reduced in amount or mitigated in form by such a state of things. The Southern States have the sole control of the question, under the authority and by contract of the Federal Constitution, and all hope of removing the evil of slavery, without destroying the National compact and the union of the States, must connect with the individual sovereignty of the Southern States, as parties to the Federal compact, and the independent policy of each State in relation to slavery, as likely to be influenced by moral and political reasons and motives, brought to bear, by proper means and methods, upon the understanding and moral sense of the Southern people. All trespass upon right, whether as it regards the rights of property or of character—every thing like aggression, mere denunciation or abuse, must of necessity tend to provoke further resistance on the part of the South, and lessen the influence the North might otherwise have upon the great mass of the Southern people, in relation to this great and exciting interest. The true character and actual relations of slavery in the United States, are *so predominantly civil and political*, that any attempt to treat the subject or control the question, upon purely moral and ecclesiastical grounds, can never exert any salutary influence South, except in so far as the moral and ecclesiastical shall be found strictly subordinate to the civil and political. This mode of appeal, it is believed, will never satisfy the North. The whole Northern portion of the Church, speaking through their guides and leaders, is manifesting an increasing disposition to form issues upon the subject, so utterly inconsistent with the rights and peace of the slaveholding States, that by how far the Methodist Episcopal Church, in the South, may contribute to the bringing about of such a state of things, or may fail to resist it, the influence of Methodism must be depressed, and the interest of the Church suffer. In addition then, to the fact, that we have already received an amount of injury, beyond what we can bear, except

under a separate organization, we have the strongest grounds of apprehension, that unless we place ourselves in a state of defence and prepare for independent action, under the distinct jurisdiction we are now authorized by the General Conference to resolve upon, and organize, we shall soon find ourselves so completely subjected to the adverse views and policy of the Northern majority, as to be left without right or remedy, except as a mere secession from the Church. Now, the case is entirely different, as we propose to do nothing, not authorized in the General Conference plan of separation, either expressly or by necessary implication. The general view thus far taken of the subject, is intended to show, that "the Annual Conferences in the slaveholding States," embracing the entire Church South, have found themselves placed in circumstances, by the action of the General Conference in May last, which according to the declaration of the Southern Delegates, at the time, render it impracticable to accomplish the objects of the Christian Ministry and Church organization, under the present system of General Conference control, and showing by the most clear and conclusive evidence, that there exists the most urgent necessity for the 'separate ecclesiastical connection,' constitutionally provided for by the General Conference upon the basis of the Declaration, just adverted to. At the date of the Declaration, the Southern Delegates were fully convinced that the frequent and exciting agitation and action in that body on the subject of slavery and abolition, as in Harding's case and especially the proceedings in the case of Bishop Andrew, each being regarded as but a practical exposition of the principle of the majority—rendered a *separate organization* indispensable to the success of Methodism in the South. The truth of the Declaration, so far from being called in question, by the majority, was promptly conceded in the immediate action the Conference had upon it, assigning the Declaration as the sole ground or reason of the action, which terminated in the adoption of the plan of separation, under which we are now acting, as a Convention, and from the spirit and intention of which, it is believed to be the purpose of the Convention not to depart, in any of its deliberations or final acts. Although the action of this General Conference on the subject of slavery, and the relative adverse position of the parties North and South, together with the irritating and exasperating evils of constant agitation and frequent attempts at legislation, are made in the Declaration, the grounds of the avowal, that a separate organization was necessary to the success of the Ministry in the slaveholding States, it was by no means intended to convey the idea, or make the impression, that no other causes existed rendering a separate organization proper

and necessary; but as the action of the Conference on the subject of slavery, was certain to involve the Church in the South, in immediate and alarming difficulty, and it was believed that this could be so shown to the majority, as to induce them to consent to some course of action, in remedy of the evil, the complaint of the Declaration was confined to the simple topic of slavery. It will be perceived that the case of Bishop Andrew, although prominently introduced, is not relied upon as exclusively furnishing the data of this conclusion at which we have arrived. The entire action of the General Conference so frequently brought to view, and which is made the ground of dissent and action, both in the Protest and Declaration of the Southern Delegates, must be understood as belonging to the premises and language employed as including all the principles avowed, as well as the action had by the late General Conference on the subject of slavery. The attempt to disclaim the judicial character of the action in Bishop Andrew's case, and show it to be merely advisory, cannot affect the preceding reasoning, for first; the disclaimer is as equivocal in character, as the original action: and secondly; the reasoning in support of the disclaimer, negatives the supposition of mere advice, because it involves issues coming legitimately within the province of judicial process and legal determination, and thirdly; Bishop Andrew is by the explanation of the disclaimer itself, held as responsible for his conduct, in view of the alleged advice, as he could have been held by the original action without the explanation. While, therefore, the explanation giving the original action an *advisory* character, notwithstanding the inconsistency involved, fully protects Bishops Soule and Andrew from even the shadow of blame in the course they have pursued, the entire action in the case, and especially when connected with the case of Harding, as alluded to in the Declaration, fully sustains the general view of the subject we have taken in this report. The Southern delegates at the General Conference, in presenting to that body their declaration and protest, acted, and they continue to act, as the representatives of the South, under the full conviction that the principles and policy avowed by the Northern majority, are such as to render their *public* and *practical renunciation* by the Southern Methodist Ministry and people, necessary to the safety, not less than the success of the Church in the South.

Other views of the subject, however, must claim a share of our attention. Among the many weighty reasons which influence the Southern Conferences in seeking to be released from the jurisdiction of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church as now constituted, are the novel and as we think dangerous doctrines, practically avowed and endorsed

by that body and the Northern portion of the Church generally, with regard to the *constitution* of the Church, and the constitutional rights and powers respectively, of the EPISCOPACY and the General Conference. In relation to the first, it is confidently, although most unaccountably, maintained that the six short *Restrictive Rules* which were adopted in 1808, and first became obligatory, as an amendment to the constitution, in 1812, are in fact the *true* and *only* constitution of the Church. This single position, should it become an established principle of action to the extent it found favor with the last General Conference, must subvert the government of the Methodist Episcopal Church. It must be seen at once, that the position leaves many of the organic laws and most important institutions of the Church entirely unprotected and at the mercy of a mere and ever fluctuating majority of the General Conference. Episcopacy, for example, although protected in the abstract, in general terms, may be entirely superceded or destroyed by the simple omission to elect or consecrate Bishops, neither of which is provided for in the Restrictive Articles. The whole itinerant system, except general superintendency, is without protection in the Restrictive Rules; and there is nothing in them preventing the Episcopacy from restricting their superintendency to *local* and *settled* Pastors, rather than a traveling ministry, and thus destroying the most distinctive feature of Wesleyan Methodism. So far as the Restrictive Rules are concerned, the Annual Conferences are without protection, and might also be destroyed by the General Conference at any time. If the new constitutional theory be correct, class leaders and private members are as eligible, upon the basis of the constitution, to a seat in the General Conference, as any Ministers of the Church. Societies too, instead of Annual Conferences, may elect delegates, and may elect *laymen* instead of ministers, or local instead of traveling ministers. Very few indeed of the more fundamental and distinguishing elements of Methodism, deeply and imperishably imbedded in the affection and veneration of the Church, and vital to its very existence, are even alluded to in the Restrictive Articles. This theory assumes the self-refuted absurdity, that the General Conference is in fact the government of the Church, if not the Church itself. With no other constitution than these mere restrictions upon the powers and rights of the General Conference, the government and Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church as a system of organized laws and well adjusted instrumentalities for the spread of the Gospel, and the diffusion of piety, and whose living principles of energy and action have so long commanded the admiration of the world, would soon cease even to exist. The startling assumption, that a Bishop of the

Methodist Episcopal Church, instead of holding office under the constitution, and by tenure of law, and the faithful performance of duty, is nothing in his character of Bishop, but a mere officer at will, of the General Conference, and may accordingly be deposed at any time, with or without cause, accusation, proof, or form of trial, as a dominant majority may capriciously elect, or party interests suggest—and that the General Conference may do, by right, whatever is not prohibited by the Restrictive Rules, and with this single exception, possess power, “supreme and all-controlling,” and this, in all possible forms of its manifestation legislative, judicial, and executive—the same men claiming to be at the same time both the fountain and functionaries of all the powers of government, which powers thus mingled and concentrated into a common force, may at any time be employed, at the prompting of their own interests, caprice or ambition.—Such wild and revolutionary assumptions, so unlike the Faith and Discipline of Methodism, as we have been taught them, we are compelled to regard as fraught with mischief and ruin to the best interests of the Church, and as furnishing a strong additional reason why we should avail ourselves of the warrant we now have, but may never again obtain, from the General Conference, to “establish an ecclesiastical connexion,” embracing only the Annual Conferences in the slaveholding States.

Without intending anything more than a general specification of the disabilities, under which the Southern part of the Church labors, in view of existing difficulties, and must continue to do so until they are removed, we must not omit to state, that should we submit to the action of the late General Conference, and decline a separate organization, it would be to place, and finally confirm the whole Southern ministry in the relation of an *inferior caste*, the effect of which, in spite of all effort to the contrary, would be such a relation, if not (as we think) real degradation of the ministry, as to destroy its influence to a great—a most fearful extent throughout the South. A practical proscription, under show of legal right, has long been exercised towards the South, with regard to the higher offices of the Church, especially the Episcopacy. To this, however, the South submitted with patient endurance, and was willing further to submit in order to maintain the peace and unity of the Church, while the *principle* involved, was disavowed, and decided to be unjust as by the decision of the General Conference in 1840. But when in 1844, the General Conference declared by their action, without the forms of legislative or judicial process, that the mere providential ownership of slave property, in a State where emancipation is

legally prohibited under all circumstances, and can only be effected by special legislative enactment, was hereafter to operate as a forfeiture of right in all similar cases, the law of the Church and the decision of the preceding General Conference to the contrary notwithstanding, the Southern ministry were compelled to realize, that they were deliberately fixed by the brand of common shame, in the degrading relation of standing inferiority to ministers, not actually, nor yet liable to be, connected with slavery, and that they were published to the Church and the world as belonging to a *caste* in the ministry, from which the higher offices of the Church could never be selected.

To submit, under such circumstances, would have been a practical, a most humiliating recognition of the *inferiority of caste*, attempted to be fixed upon us by the Northern majority, and would have justly authorized the inference of a want of conscious integrity and self-respect, well calculated to destroy both the reputation and influence of the ministry in all the slaveholding States. It may be no virtue to avow it, but we confess we have no humility courting the grace of such a baptism. The higher objects, therefore, of the Christian Ministry, not less than conscious right and self-respect, demanded resistance on the part of the Southern Ministry and Church, and these unite with other reasons, in vindicating the plea of necessity, upon which the meeting and action of this Convention are based, with the consent and approval of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church. The variety of interests involved, renders it necessary that the brief view of the subject we are allowed to take, be varied accordingly.

Unless the Southern Conferences organize as proposed, it is morally certain, in view of the evidence before the Committee, that the Gospel now regularly and successfully dispensed by the ministers of these Conferences to about a million of slaves, in their various fields of missionary enterprise and pastoral charge, must, to a great extent, be withheld from them, and immense masses of this unfortunate class of our fellow beings be left to perish, as the result of Church interference with the civil affairs and relations of the country.

The Committee are compelled to believe, that the mere division of jurisdiction, as authorized by the General Conference, cannot affect either the moral or legal unity of the great American family of Christians, known as the Methodist Episcopal Church, and this opinion is concurred in by the ablest jurists of the country. We do nothing but what we are *expressly authorized to do* by the supreme, or rather highest legislative power of the Church. Would the Church authorize us to do wrong? The division relates only to the power of general

jurisdiction, which it is not proposed to destroy or even reduce, but simply to invest it in two great organs of Church action and control, instead of one as at present. Such a change in the present system of general control, cannot disturb the moral unity of the Church, for it is strictly an *agreed modification* of General Conference jurisdiction, and such agreement and consent of parties must preclude the idea of disunion. In view of *what* is the alleged disunion predicated? Is the purpose and act of becoming a separate organization proof of disunion or want of proper Church unity? This cannot be urged with any show of consistency, inasmuch as "the several Annual Conferences in General Conference assembled," that is to say, the Church through only its constitutional organ of action, on all subjects involving the power of legislation, not only agreed to the separate organization South, but made full constitutional provision for carrying it into effect. It is a separation by consent of parties, under the highest authority of the Church. Is it intended to maintain that the unity of the Church depends upon the modal uniformity of the jurisdiction in question? If this be so, the Methodist Episcopal Church has lost its unity at several different times. The general jurisdiction of the Church has undergone modifications, at several different times, not less vital, if not greatly more so, than the one now proposed. The high conventional powers, of which we are so often reminded, exercised in the organization of the Methodist Episcopal Church, were in the hands of a Conference of unordained lay preachers, under the sole superintendence of an appointee of Mr. Wesley. This was the first General Conference type and original form of the jurisdiction in question. The jurisdictional power now proposed by the General Conference, was for years exercised by small Annual Conferences, without any defined boundaries, and acting separately on all measures proposed for their determination. This general power of jurisdiction next passed into the hands of the Bishops' Council, consisting of some ten persons, where it remained for a term of years. Next it passed into the hands of the whole itinerant Ministry, in full connection, and was exercised by them, in collective action, as a General Conference of the whole body, met together at the same time. The power was afterwards vested in the whole body of traveling Elders, and from thence finally passed into the hands of Delegates, elected by the Annual Conferences, to meet and act quadrennially as a General Conference, under constitutional restrictions and limitations. Here are several successive re-organizations of General Conference jurisdiction, each involving a much more material change than that contemplated in the General Conference plan, by authority of which, this Convention is about to erect

the sixteen Annual Conferences in the slaveholding States into a separate organization. We change no principle in the existing theory of General Conference jurisdiction. We distinctly recognize the jurisdiction of a delegated General Conference, receiving its appointment and authority from the whole constituency of Annual Conferences. The only change in fact or in form, will be, that the Delegates of the "Annual Conferences in the slaveholding States," as authorized in the plan of separation, will meet in one General Conference assembly of their own, and act in behalf only of their own constituency, and in the regulation of their own affairs, consistently with the good faith and fealty they owe the authority and laws of the several States in which they reside, without interfering with affairs beyond their jurisdiction, or suffering foreign interference with their own. And in proceeding to do this, we have all the authority it was in the power of the Methodist Episcopal Church to confer. We have also further example and precedent in the history of Methodism, to show that there is nothing irregular or inconsistent with Church order or unity in the separation proposed. The great Wesleyan Methodist family, everywhere one in faith and practice, already exists under several distinct and unconnected jurisdictions—there is no jurisdictional or connectional union between them; and yet it has never been pretended, that these several distinct organizations were in any sense inconsistent with Church unity. If the Southern Conferences proceed, then, to the establishment of another distinct jurisdiction, without any change of doctrine or discipline, except in matters necessary to the mere economical adjustment of the system, will it furnish any reason for supposing that the real unity of the Church is affected by what all must perceive to be a simple division of jurisdiction? When the Conferences in the slaveholding States are separately organized as a distinct ecclesiastical connection, they will only be what the General Conference authorized them to be. Can this be irregular or subversive of Church unity? Acting under the provisional plan of separation they must, although a separate organization, remain in essential union with, and be part and parcel of the Methodist Episcopal Church, in every scriptural and moral view of the subject; for what they do is with the full consent, and has the official sanction of the Church as represented in the General Conference. The jurisdiction we are about to establish and assert as separate and independent, is expressly declined and ceded by the General Conference as originally its own, to the Southern Conferences, for the specific purpose of being established and asserted in the manner proposed. All idea of secession, or an organization alien in right or relation to the

Methodist Episcopal Church, is forever precluded by the terms and conditions of the authorized plan of separation. In whatever sense we are *separatists* or *seceders*, we are such by authority—the *highest* authority of the Methodist Episcopal Church. To whatever extent or in whatever aspect we are not true and faithful ministers and members of that Church, such delinquency or misfortune is authenticated by her act and approval, and she declares us to be “without blame.” “Ministers of every grade and office in the Methodist Episcopal Church, may, as they prefer, without blame, attach themselves to the Church South.” Bishops, elders, and deacons, come into the Southern organization at their own election, under permission from the General Conference, not only accredited as ministers of the Methodist Episcopal Church, but with credentials *limiting* the exercise of their functions *within the Methodist Episcopal Church*. Is it conceivable that the General Conference, would so act and hold such language in relation to an ecclesiastical connection which was to be regarded as a secession from the Church? Does not such act and language, and the whole plan of separation, rather show that, as the South had asked, so the General Conference intended to authorize, a simple division of its own jurisdiction, and nothing more?

All idea of secession or schism or loss of right or title, as ministers of the Methodist Episcopal Church, being precluded by the specific grant or authority under which we act, as well as for other reasons assigned, many considerations might be urged, strongly suggesting the *fitness* and *propriety* of the separate jurisdiction contemplated, rendered *necessary*, as we have seen, upon *other* and *different* grounds; and among these the increased value of the representative principle likely to be secured by the change, is by no means unworthy of notice. At the first representative General Conference, thirty-three years ago, each delegate represented five traveling ministers and about two thousand members, and the body was of convenient size for the transaction of business. At the late General Conference, each delegate was the representative of twenty-one ministers and more than five thousand members, and the body was inconveniently large for the purpose of deliberation and action. Should the number of delegates in the General Conference be increased with the probable growth of the Church, the body will soon become utterly unwieldy.—Should the number be reduced, while the ministry and membership are multiplying, the representative principle would become to be little more than nominal, and in the same proportion, without practical value. Beside that the proposed re-organization of jurisdiction will remedy this evil, at least to

a great extent, it will result in the saving of much time and expense and useful services to the Church, connected with the travel and protracted sessions of the General Conference, not only as it regards the delegates, but also the bench of Bishops, whose general oversight might become much more minute and pastoral in its character, by means of such an arrangement. When, in 1808, the Annual Conferences resolved upon changing the form of General Conference jurisdiction, the precise reasons we have just noticed, were deemed sufficient ground and motive for the change introduced, and as we are seeking only a similar change of jurisdiction, although for other purposes as well as this, the facts to which we ask attention, are certainly worthy of being taken into the estimate of advantages likely to result from a separate and independent organization, especially as the ministry and membership, since 1808, have increased *full seven hundred per centum*, and should they continue to increase, in something like the same ratio, for thirty years to come, under the present system of General Conference jurisdiction, some such change as that authorized by the late General Conference must be resorted to, or the Church resign itself to the virtual extinction of the representative principle, as an important element of government action.

In establishing a separate jurisdiction as before defined and explained, so far from affecting the moral oneness and integrity of the great Methodist body in America, the effect will be to secure a very different result. In resolving upon a separate Connection, as we are about to do, the one great and controlling motive is to restore and perpetuate the peace and unity of the Church. At present we have neither, nor are we likely to have, should the Southern and Northern Conferences remain in connectional relation, as heretofore. Inferring effects from causes known to be in existence and active operation, agitation on the subject of slavery is certain to continue, and frequent action in the General Conference is equally certain, and the result, as heretofore, will be excitement and discontent, aggression and resistance. Should the South retire and decline all further conflict, by the crection of the Southern Conferences into a separate jurisdiction, as authorized by the General Conference plan, agitation in the Church cannot be brought in contact with the South, and the former irritation and evils of the controversy must, to a great extent, cease, or at any rate so lose their disturbing force as to become comparatively harmless. Should the Northern Church continue to discuss and agitate, it will be within their own borders and among themselves, and the evil effects upon the South must, to say the least, be greatly lessened. At present, the consolidation of all the Annual Conferences, under the jurisdictional

control of one General Conference, always giving a decided Northern majority, places it in the power of that majority to manage and control the interests of the Church, in the slave-holding States, as they see proper, and we have no means of protection against the evils certain to be inflicted upon us, if we judge the future from the past. The whole power of legislation is in the General Conference, and as that body is now constituted, the Annual Conferences of the South are perfectly powerless in the resistance of wrong, and have no alternative left them but unconditional submission. And such submission, to the views and action of the Northern majority on the subject of slavery, it is now demonstrated must bring disaster and ruin upon Southern Methodism, by rendering the Church an object of distrust on the part of the State. In this way, the assumed *conservative power* of the Methodist Episcopal Church, with regard to the *civil union* of the States, is to a great extent destroyed, and we are compelled to believe that it is the *interest* and becomes the *duty* of the Church in the South to seek to exert *such conservative influence* in some *other* form; and after the most mature deliberation and careful examination of the whole subject, we know of nothing so likely to effect the object, as the jurisdictional separation of the great Church parties, unfortunately involved in a religious and ecclesiastical controversy about an affair of State—a question of civil policy, over which the Church has no control, and with which it is believed, she has no right to interfere. Among the nearly five hundred thousand ministers and members of the Conferences represented in this Convention, we do not know *one* not *deeply* and *intensely* interested in the *safety* and *perpetuity* of the *National Union*, nor can we for a moment hesitate to *pledge them all*, against *any* course of *action* or *policy*, not calculated, in their judgment, to *render that union as immortal as the hopes of patriotism would have it to be!*

Before closing the summary view of the whole subject taken in this report, we cannot refrain from a brief notice of the relations and interests of Southern border Conferences. These, it must be obvious, are materially different from those of the more Southern Conferences. They do not, for the present, feel the pressure of the strong necessity impelling the South proper, to immediate separation. They are, however, involved with regard to the subject matter of the controversy, and committed to well defined principles, in the same way, and to the same extent, with the most Southern Conferences. They have with almost perfect unanimity, by public official acts, protested against the entire action of the late General Conference on the subject of slavery, and in reference to the relative rights and powers of Episcopacy and the General Confer-

ence, as not only *unconstitutional*, but *revolutionary*, and, therefore, dangerous to the best interests of the Church. They have solemnly declared, by approving and endorsing the declaration, the protest and address of the Southern delegates, that the objects of their ministry cannot be accomplished, under the existing jurisdiction of the General Conference, without reparation for past injury and security against future aggression, and unless the border Conferences have good and substantial reason to believe such reparation and security not only *probable*, but so certain as to remove *reasonable* doubt, they have, so far as *principle* and pledge are concerned, the same motive for action with the Conferences South of them. Against the principles thus avowed by every one of the Conferences in question, the anti-slavery and abolition of the North have, through official Church organs, declared the most open and undisguised hostility, and these Conferences are reduced to the necessity of deciding upon *adherence* to the principles they have officially avowed, or of a resort to expediency to adjust difficulties in some unknown form, which they have said could only be adjusted by substantial reparation for past injury, and good and sufficient warrant against future aggression. The question is certainly one of no common interest. Should any of the border Conferences, or societies South, affiliate with the North, the effect, so far as we can see, will be to transfer the seat of war from the remoter South, to these border districts; and what, we ask, will be the security of these districts against the moral ravages of such a war? What protection or security will the *discipline* or the *conservatism* of the middle Conferences afford? Of what avail were *these* at the last General Conference, and has *either* more influence now than then? The controversy of a large and rapidly increasing portion of the North, is not so much with the *South* as with the *discipline*, because it tolerates slavery *in any form* whatever, and should the Southern Conferences remain under the present common jurisdiction, or any slaveholding portions of the South unite in the Northern Connection in the event of division, it requires very little discernment to see that *this controversy* will never cease until every slaveholder or every Abolitionist is out of the connection. Beside, the border Conferences have a great and most delicate interest at stake, in view of their *territorial* and *civil* and *political* relations, which it certainly behooves them to weigh well and examine with care in coming to the final conclusion, which is to identify them with the North or the South. Border districts going with the North, after and notwithstanding the action of the border Conferences, must, in the nature of things, as found in the Methodist Episcopal Church, affiliate, to a great extent, with the entire aggregate of North-

ern anti-slavery and abolition, as now embarked against the interests of the South—as also with all the recent official violations of right, of law, and discipline, against which the South is now contending. In doing this, they must of necessity, if we have reasoned correctly, elect, and contribute their influence to retain in the connection of their choice all the principles and elements of strife and discord which have so long and fearfully convulsed the Church. Will this be the election of Southern border sections and districts, or will they remain where, by location, civil and political ties and relations, and their own avowed principles, they properly belong, firmly planted upon the long and well tried platform of the discipline of our common choice, and from which the Methodism of the South has never manifested any disposition to swerve? To the discipline the South has always been loyal. By it she has *abided* in every trial. Jealously has she cherished and guarded that “form of sound words”—the faith, the ritual, and the government of the Church. It was Southern defence against Northern invasion of the discipline, which brought on the present struggle; and upon the discipline, the whole discipline, the South proposes to organise, under authority of the General Conference, a separate connection of the Methodist Episcopal Church. This result, from first to last, has been consented to on the part of the South with the greatest reluctance.

After the struggle came on, at the late General Conference, the Southern Delegates, as they had often done before, manifested the most earnest desire, and did all in their power, to maintain jurisdictional union with the North, without sacrificing the interests of the South: when this was found impracticable, a *Connectional* union was proposed, and the rejection of this, by the North, led to the *projection* and *adoption* of the present General Conference plan of separation. Every overture of compromise, every plan of reconciliation and adjustment, regarded as at all eligible, or likely to succeed, was offered by the South and rejected by the North. All subsequent attempts at compromise, have failed in like manner, and the probability of any such adjustment, if not extinct, is lessening every day, and the Annual Conferences in the slaveholding States are thus left to take their position upon the ground assigned them by the General Conference of 1844, as a distinct ecclesiastical Connection, ready and most willing to treat with the Northern division of the Church, at any time, in view of adjusting the difficulties of this controversy, upon terms and principles, which may be safe and satisfactory to both.

Such we regard as the *true position of the Annual Conferences* represented in this Convention. Therefore, in view of all the principles and interests involved, appealing to the Almighty

searcher of hearts, for the sincerity of our motives, and humbly invoking the Divine blessing upon our action,

Be it Resolved, by the Delegates of the several Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, in the slaveholding States, in General Convention assembled, That it is right, expedient, and necessary to erect the Annual Conferences, represented in this Convention, into a distinct ecclesiastical Connection, separate from the jurisdiction of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, as at present constituted; and, accordingly, we, the Delegates of said Annual Conferences, acting under the provisional plan of separation adopted by the General Conference of 1844, do solemnly declare the jurisdiction hitherto exercised over said Annual Conferences, by the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, entirely dissolved; and that said Annual Conferences shall be, and they hereby are constituted a separate ecclesiastical Connection, under the provisional plan of separation aforesaid, and based upon the Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church, comprehending the doctrines, and entire moral, ecclesiastical, and economical rules and regulations of said Discipline, except only, in so far as verbal alterations may be necessary to a distinct organization, and to be known by the style and title of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South.

Resolved, That Bishops Soule and Andrew be, and they are hereby respectfully and cordially requested by this Convention to unite with, and become regular and constitutional Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, upon the basis of the plan of separation adopted by the late General Conference.

Resolved, That this Convention request the Bishops presiding at the ensuing sessions of the border Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, to incorporate into the aforesaid Conferences any societies or stations adjoining the line of division, provided such societies or stations by the majority of the members, according to the provisions of the plan of separation, aforesaid, request such an arrangement.

Resolved, That answer the 2d of 3d Section, Chapter 1st, of the book of Discipline, be so altered and amended as to read as follows: "The General Conference shall meet on the 1st of May, in the year of our Lord, 1846, in the town of Petersburg, Va., and thenceforward, in the month of April or May, once in four years successively, and in such place and on such day as shall be fixed on by the preceding General Conference," etc.

Resolved, That the first answer in the same chapter, be altered by striking out the word "twenty-one," and inserting in its place the word "fourteen," so as to entitle each Annual Conference to one Delegate for every fourteen members.

Resolved, That a committee of three be appointed, whose

duty it shall be to prepare and report to the General Conference of 1846, a revised copy of the present Discipline, with such changes as are necessary to conform it to the organization of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South.

Resolved, That while we cannot abandon or compromise the principles of action upon which we proceed to a separate organization in the South; nevertheless, cherishing a sincere desire to maintain Christian union and fraternal intercourse, with the Church North, we shall always be ready, kindly and respectfully to entertain, and duly and carefully consider, any proposition or plan, having for its object, the union of the two great bodies, in the North and South, whether such proposed union be *jurisdictional* or *connectional*.

CHAPTER V.

Embracing events subsequent to the adjournment of the Louisville Convention.

THE meeting of a Convention of Delegates, from the Southern and South-western Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was a novel proceeding in the history of the Church, and consequently attracted great attention. Vast numbers attended its session, and many from a great distance, to observe its doings and witness the result of its deliberations. There were many speeches of uncommon ability delivered, the interests of the public mind was kept quickly alive throughout the protracted session, and it was quite evident that an impression deep and wide had been made on the community in favor of the Southern cause.

This result was readily foreseen by the leading men of the North, and measures were taken in advance to counteract it. The opposing editors, (one of whom had, in the General Conference, advocated division in the abstract—as necessary apart from the slavery controversy, and another had advocated a positive boundary, beyond which—even on the border—no one might pass, as the only way to secure peace) labored to impress the public mind unfavorably with regard to the Convention. It was contended that the people very generally were opposed to it, and that a large proportion of the preachers were with them in this opposition;—that the divisive movements were led on by a few ambitious leaders seeking their own aggrandizement;—that the proceeding was irregular and unmethodistical, as the General Conference had not authorized it, &c. This last argument, considering its want of soundness, had considerable effect for a time. The more considerate, however, soon came to perceive that as the General Conference had granted to the South the right to decide on the *necessity of division*, that grant must necessarily embrace the right to take such action as would enable them to make up that important decision in the best and most satisfactory manner.

It was also predicted that there would be great discord in the Convention, and it was doubted whether any course could be suggested which would secure the acquiescence of even a majority of that body. And this conjecture received some apparent strength from the fact, that though all the delegates elected disapproved the action in the case of Bishop Andrew, and rejected the principle involved in it as unsound and dangerous, yet some of them were not convinced, at the time of assembling, that *present* separation was absolutely necessary, and therefore inclined to defer final action, either until the meeting of the regular General Conference of 1848, or until a special meeting of that body could be called to attempt an adjustment of the difficulty;—or to propose terms on which they would agree to remain in connection with the North, and leave that portion of the Church to accept or reject the terms—to perpetuate the union or effectuate the separation. When however, the Convention, with but three exceptions, came to the conclusion that separation was absolutely necessary, and necessary *now*, and when those three, after casting their votes, cordially feel in and cheerfully co-operated with the majority, the very unanimity of the action produced strengthened confidence in the community, and many who had previously doubted, hesitated, or even opposed, now acquiesced and came promptly forward to sustain the course of the Convention.

The question was now considered as finally settled; and from this time the prevailing desire of the South—editors, ministers, and people—evidently was to discontinue the conflict and cultivate peace with our Northern brethren; and if we could not unite with them under one jurisdiction, to unite in one spirit of forbearance and love. And this sentiment was reciprocated on the part of many Northern brethren, and even those Church papers from which the South originally expected least.

Not so the *leading* Church papers of the Northern connection. They set themselves diligently to work to prove to the world, that the Southern organization was an actual *secession* from the Church, “if not indeed a *scism* of the worst sort;”—that all who did not go with the Northern Connection, whether located North or South, were no longer members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, but of a *pro-slavery* Church, the object of which was to strengthen slavery and encourage and protect slaveholding in the ministry;—that the Convention was not held in accordance with the plan of separation;—that the Plan itself was unconstitutional and void. They accordingly encouraged all in the South, over whom they could exert any influence, to adhere to the Northern division of the Church, and holding out as inducements the declaration that

the Church property in the South, purchased with the money and for the accommodation of Southern societies, would all fall into the hands of those—however few—who should adhere to the North, and assuring such, that the North would send them preachers and amply provide for their supply. Assuming that there were many disaffected ministers in the South, they urged such to an utter disregard of the plan of separation, by forming themselves into a separate Conference where they were in a minority, and assuring them that however few in number, they would be recognized as the true Annual Conference—of Kentucky, Missouri, or Holston, as the case might be,—and would draw the dividend from the Book Concern due the Conference whose name they were recommended to assume.

Bishop Soule, as has been seen in the preceding Chapter, had intimated to the Convention his purpose to pursue the plan of episcopal visitation agreed on in 1844, until the meeting of the first General Conference of the Southern Connection,—authorizing the opinion that he would then fully identify himself with the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. This gave great offence in the same quarters, and he was denounced in more unmeasured terms of censure than had been so liberally heaped on Bishop Andrew. He was charged as the prime agent in the whole divisive movement. It was declared that he had, by the act above alluded to, seceded from the Methodist Episcopal Church, and was no longer capable of exercising episcopal functions in it. In the plan of episcopal visitation for 1845, several Conferences in non-slaveholding States had been assigned to him. Those Conferences were earnestly entreated not to receive him as their presiding Bishop, as no act done under his administration would be legal—no ordination of his valid. In this course the editors were zealously and even violently supported by several ministers of age and standing, particularly Messrs. Cartwright and Akers, of Illinois, and Mr. Finley of the Ohio Conference. But while Bishop Soule had work assigned him on the episcopal plan in Northern Conferences, Bishops Morris and Janes—who were regarded as Northern Bishops in good standing—had work in the South, and whether it was expedient for them to preside in Conferences, denounced as seceders, became a grave question.

Matters had now reached such a crisis that it was wisely deemed advisable to convoke a council of the Bishops to determine on the proper course to pursue, and especially to settle the principles of their own administration. This council met in the city of New York, July 2d, 1845, and was attended by Bishops Hedding, Waugh, Morris, and Janes. Bishop Hamline

sent his opinion in writing on the points to be acted on by the Council, Bishop Soule did not attend, and Bishop Andrew, being suspended, was not invited. There was some contrariety of opinion in the council on some points. Bishops Morris and Janes preferred carrying out the original plan of episcopal visitation, though the work of both, for 1845, lay within the Southern Connection, which in high places had been denounced as a secession. But a majority deemed it more prudent, under the circumstances, to form a new plan of visitation, in which the Southern Connection was not included. The council, however, resolved not to change, or in any way interfere with Bishop Soule's appointments to preside in Northern Conferences, but provided that if he should desire to be released from them, they should be attended by Bishop Morris. Besides agreeing on a new plan of visitation, the Bishops adopted the following resolutions, intended for the government of their own administration:

1. *Resolved*, That the plan reported by the select Committee of Nine at the last General Conference and adopted by that body in regard to a distinct ecclesiastical connection, should such a course be found necessary by the Annual Conferences in the slaveholding States, is regarded by us as of binding obligation in the premises, so far as our administration is concerned.

2. *Resolved*, That in order to ascertain fairly the desire and purpose of those societies bordering on the line of division, in regard to their adherence to the Church, North or South, due notice should be given of the time, place, and object of meeting for the above purpose, at which a Chairman and Secretary should be appointed, and the sense of all the members present be ascertained, and the same be forwarded to the Bishop who may preside at the ensuing Annual Conferences; or forward to said presiding Bishop a written request to be recognized and have a preacher sent them, with the names of the majority appended thereto.

A true copy.

EDMUND S. JANES, Sec'y.

By these wise and prudent resolves the Bishops have entitled themselves to the gratitude of the Church,—have shown that they are the true *conservatives*, and have insured to themselves the commendation of posterity.

This action of the Bishops, when it came to be known and understood, was mightily influential in calming the troubled waters and settling the public mind. And though by the two leading papers opposing the General Conference plan of separation, it was treated with no apparent respect whatever, with the vast majority the case was far otherwise. And

these sound and conservative views were ably seconded by men of the highest standing in the Northern connection. Drs. Bangs and Olin contended with great ability, that the faith and honor of the Church were deeply concerned in carrying out the plan of separation, adopted by the General Conference, and thereby greatly endeared themselves to the lovers of peace and justice, North and South. The Church papers too, with the exceptions mentioned, generally took the same honorable ground.

At the close of the General Conference of 1844, Dr. H. B. Bascom, in behalf of the Southern minority, gave notice of his intention to review, at his convenience, the Reply of Drs. Durban, Peck and Elliott, to the Protest of the Minority of the General Conference. Immediately before the meeting of the Louisville Convention, this review made its appearance under the title of "Methodism and Slavery," &c., and was rapidly and widely circulated—an edition of six thousand copies having been sold almost immediately, without nearly supplying the demand. This powerful production made a strong impression favorable to the cause of the Church South, which was strongly seconded by the clear and able Report of the Committee of the Louisville Convention on a Southern Organization, drawn up by the same hand.

Dr. Bascom's Review was replied to by Dr. Peck, one of the committee who replied to the Protest, and Editor of the Methodist Quarterly Review. This attempt to answer the clear reasoning of Dr. Bascom's work, was a remarkable failure. The work of Dr. Peck abounds in special pleading,—imputes to the South doctrines never entertained by it or Dr. Bascom, and advocates at length opinions never broached until the General Conference of 1844, as the orthodox doctrines of Methodism.

The chief effect of Dr. Peck's book will doubtless be, to mark by clearer and more indelible lines, a distinction between the North and the South on the subject of ecclesiastical polity. In short, the doctrines of that book are those of the famous Reply to the Protest, carried out into minuter detail,—doctrines which the South unanimously reject, and about which there has been great disagreement in the North; but more uniformity must be superinduced by it in the Northern Connection—if it should be read and received as authority.

The plan of separation contemplated action by the border Conferences, as the appointed means of fixing their connectional relation as Conferences, either North or South. Of course, therefore, no border Conference as such, could be regarded as strictly belonging to the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, until a majority of its members had voted to adhere to that

connection. The action of these Conferences was therefore looked to with much interest. It was thought, and especially by our Northern brethren, that there would be much division in all those Conferences. In most of them large Northern *minorities*, if not indeed majorities—were claimed; with how much forecast and correctness, will be seen by the report of the official action of those Conferences.

But before we notice the final and decisive action of the border Conferences on the question, we must pay some attention to the action of some of the Conferences on the general subject, which were not called on to act by their relation to the plan of separation, nor by any other consideration of which we can conceive, save that of a desire to place the South in the wrong in this whole business.

The first of the "Conservative" Conferences, whose action claims notice here, is the NORTH OHIO. The following nullifying action was had by that respectable body of ministers:—

WHEREAS, a Convention of delegates from several Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the slaveholding States, assembled at Louisville, in May last, did formally dissolve their connection with the Methodist Episcopal Church, and form themselves into a distinct ecclesiastical organization, under the style and title of the "Methodist Episcopal Church, South," claiming, as authority for said act, the provisional plan of separation recommended by the last General Conference, notwithstanding said plan is *void*, (allowing that the General Conference had the constitutional right to recommend it.) by the refusal of the Annual Conferences to confirm it. And, *whereas*, it appears to us, that our Southern brethren have not found such a necessity for separating from the Methodist Episcopal Church, as was affirmed, did, or would exist; and on the *real undoubted existence of which necessity* the General Conference *based* the plan of separation; and, *whereas*, said Convention did by resolution provide for the incorporation of all societies within the slaveholding States, (represented in the Convention,) and for the representation of fractional portions of Conferences, (not represented in the Convention) in their General Conference, thereby violating the *letter*, as well as the *spirit* of the plan; and, *whereas*, there are many ministers and members of the Methodist Episcopal Church within the jurisdiction claimed by the Southern organization, who cannot consent to be transferred from the Church of their choice by the force of a *dead* recommendation, but will remain, or seek to remain, under the jurisdiction of the Methodist Episcopal Church, from a conviction that the act of separation is unnecessary, revolutionary in its character, and drawing after

it all the fearful consequences of a schism in the body of Christ. Therefore,

1. *Resolved, by the North Ohio Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Conference assembled*, That we deeply regret the precipitate haste with which this great and momentous action has been had by the Southern Conferences.

2. That we can view the action of the Louisville Convention in no other light than that of secession, (made respectable by the number engaged in it,) and a voluntary surrender of all right and privilege in the Methodist Episcopal Church.

3. That those who adhere to the Methodist Episcopal Church, have our sympathy in this their hour of darkness; that for them we will make supplication continually, that they may endure hardiness as good soldiers; and that we will furnish them aid as they may require.

4. That it is the duty of the Methodist Episcopal Church to provide for the special wants of our Southern brethren who adhere to her jurisdiction, whether they be majorities or minorities of Conferences, circuits, stations, or societies.

5. That we recommend to our adhering brethren in the South, in such prudent way as they best can, agreeably to the Discipline of our Church, to continue the organization of their Conferences, districts, circuits, stations, and classes, until the next General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

6. That in our opinion it will be the duty of the next General Conference to provide fully for all who desire to continue in, or who may return to, the Methodist Episcopal Church, that they may enjoy all those inalienable privileges to which they have a constitutional right, and which cannot be wrested from them.

The next Conference to meet was OHIO. This body met in the city of Cincinnati, September 3d, 1845. During part of its session Bishop Soule happened to be in the city, and Bishop Hamline, the presiding Bishop of the Conference, in the exercise of the courtesy due the venerable senior Bishop of the Church, invited him to take part in the official duties of the Conference. Bishop Soule accordingly opened the session with the usual religious services, and was about to proceed with the regular business, when an aged minister—Rev. Jacob Young—offered the following for adoption by the Conference:

WHEREAS, Bishops Soule and Andrew did preside at the Convention at Louisville, in May last, composed of delegates from the Southern Conferences; and *whereas*, said Convention did resolve the said Conferences into a “separate and distinct ecclesiastical connection,” solemnly declaring that they were no longer under the jurisdiction of the Methodist Episcopal

Church; and, *whereas*, Bishops Soule and Andrew did pledge their adherence to the Church South: and in view of the Southern organization, and the course of said Bishops at a meeting of the Bishops in New York, Bishops Morris and Janes declined presiding in the Southern Conferences; therefore,

Resolved, That although the Conferences composing the Methodist Episcopal Church, will treat the Bishops of the Church South with due courtesy and respect, yet it would be, in the estimation of this Conference, inexpedient and highly improper for them to preside in said Conferences."

The reading of this paper produced considerable excitement. Bishop Soule remarked to the Conference that he was in the chair, not by his own seeking, but by the courteous invitation of their Bishop; that to him he was ready to resign the Chair whenever he (Bishop H.) would take it; but considering the paper offered disrespectful to their presiding Bishop, who had placed him in the position they so strongly objected to his occupying, he could not, without participating in the disrespect offered to Bishop Hamline, put the question to the Conference. Bishop Hamline, however, first called a member of the Conference to the Chair, but order not being restored, he resumed it himself and put the question on the resolution ejecting Bishop Soule from the Chair, and it was carried by a vote of 145 to 7.

Toward the close of the Conference, the following resolutions were offered, and after a spirited debate, adopted by nearly the same vote as the preceding resolution:—

"WHEREAS, events connected with the history of the Methodist Episcopal Church, involving important principles in the government of said Church, have lately transpired; and *whereas*, the position of the Annual Conferences, constituting the governmental department, should be clearly defined; therefore,

Resolved, That we heartily approve of the general tenor of the editorial course of the Western Christian Advocate and the Christian Advocate and Journal, in relation to all those questions involved in the existing controversy between the Methodist Episcopal Church and the organization styled, "the distinct and separate ecclesiastical connection of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South."

Resolved, That we hereby tender to these worthy defenders of constitutional Methodism our warmest thanks, and assure them of our sympathies, and pledge them our hearty support.

Resolved, That we tender to our brethren of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the slaveholding States, our sympathies and regards—hoping that should they not alienate themselves from the Church of their choice, the next General Conference will provide for them in the regular way.

"*Resolved*, That we consider the provisional arrangement, commonly called "the plan of separation," as a nullity, because unconstitutional in its nature, and virtually rejected by the Annual Conferences in their action in regard to the change of the "sixth restrictive rule."

"*Resolved*, That we protest against the term "North" being prefixed, or added to, or used synonymously for the "Methodist Episcopal Church" in the United States of America.

JACOB YOUNG,
GEORGE W. WALKER."

In these resolutions, it will be perceived that the Conference not only *nullified* the plan of separation, but the very men who in the General Conference voted for it and zealously advocated it, now solemnly resolved that it was *unconstitutional*, thus alike condemning the General Conference and themselves, in their earnest zeal to place the South in the wrong.

There were a few, however, even in the Conservative Conference of Ohio, who could not receive these strong doctrines, and we here give their Protest,—which, it may not be amiss to notice, could not gain admission into the official organ so liberally lauded in the resolutions above.

"We, the undersigned members of the Ohio Annual Conference, in conformity to the rights and usages of deliberative assemblies in such cases, do hereby protest against the action of the majority of the Conference, in the adoption of the resolutions offered by brothers Jacob Young and G. W. Walker, declaring the plan adopted by the last General Conference a nullity.

"1. We protest against the action of the majority in the case, because the General Conference is the supreme legislative and judicial department in the Church—the high court of appeals, beyond which we cannot travel for the cure of errors, it having full power within the restrictive rules, to make rules and regulations for the Church.

"2. Because the Board of Bishops, the highest executive authority in the Church, are the supreme constitutional judges of law in the intervals of the General Conferences, and have acknowledged said plan of the General Conference as of binding obligation, and determined to regulate their administration accordingly.

"3. Because the Annual Conference, in adopting those resolutions, acted upon the false assumption that, in their official capacity, they have power to nullify an act of the General Conference, which, in their judgment, it had no constitutional authority to pass; whereas the General Conference is the sole judge of the constitutionality of its own acts.

"4. Because the action of the General Conference provided regulations for a peaceable separation from its jurisdiction, of the Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the slaveholding States, if, in their judgment, such separation was found to be necessary: in consequence of which, the Southern Conferences finding such necessity, have proceeded to effect the contemplated separation.

"5. Because no succeeding General Conference, since such division has taken place, will possess the power to repeal said act, inasmuch as it was passed by the representatives of all the Annual Conferences in the United States, in General Conference assembled, and inasmuch as *such* a General Conference, in which all the parties interested will be represented, cannot again be constituted. Nor can either of the General Conferences, North or South, disregard or set aside the provisions of the plan, because it originated in mutual concession and compromise, and now partakes of the nature of a treaty or compact between the two existing parties, neither of which can violate or annul it, without a breach of good faith.

"6. Because the act of this body, by which the plan of separation is declared a nullity, is unconstitutional, revolutionary, and subversive of the fundamental principles involved in the government of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

J. A. WATERMAN,
S. A. LATTA,
WM. BURKE,
G. W. MALEY,
E. W. SEHON,
ISAAC EBBERT,
SAMUEL BLACK,
J. B. ELLSWORTH."

This protest subsequently received the cordial official approbation of the Quarterly Conference of one of the oldest and most respectable stations in the Northern Connection—that of St. George's, Philadelphia. Of the *eight* signers of this Protest, all except the last two named, afterwards left the Ohio Conference and united with the Southern Connection.

But far as the North Ohio and Ohio Conferences went in their opposition to the South, it was reserved for Illinois to leave them in the rear. Not only did that Conference adopt all the nullification of the others, but erected Annual Conferences into a supreme judicatory, vested with full powers to determine the constitutionality of acts done by the General Conference, and to revoke, suspend or nullify them at pleasure.

The following are their preamble and resolutions:—

"WHEREAS, The traveling ministers of the Methodist Episco-

pal Church in the United States of America are, by the Discipline of said Church, constituted its pastors, who, for the purpose of accomplishing the great and avowed object of their ministry, are divided into Annual Conferences, in which is lodged the power of appointing the delegates who compose, or constitute, the General Conference of said Church: And whereas, the Discipline gives to the General Conference the power to make rules and regulations for said Church, under limitations and restrictions, but, at the same time, it does not say where the power is lodged, to determine as to the constitutionality of the acts and doings of the General Conference: And whereas, in the absence of any disciplinary expression on this subject, it follows, that the Annual Conferences, being the immediate constituents of the General Conference, constitute the natural and proper tribunal, and exclusively possess the right to determine as to the constitutionality of all acts and doings of the General Conference; therefore,

“1. *Resolved, by the Illinois Annual Conference*, That the plan reported by the Committee of Nine, and adopted by the General Conference, called by the “Methodist Episcopal Church, South,” “A constitutional provisional plan of separation,” is, in its operations, in direct contravention of the third restrictive article of the Discipline, which prohibits the General Conference from altering said article, as follows: “They shall not change or alter any part or rule of our government, so as to do away episcopacy, or destroy the plan of our itinerant general superintendency.” This it does, in that the said plan, adopted by the General Conference, in its operations, excludes the general superintendency from the whole Church and territory South of the prescribed boundary—thus preventing them from traveling “through the connection at large.” It also contravenes the fifth restrictive article, which says, “They shall not do away the privileges of our ministers or preachers of trial by a committee, and of an appeal; neither shall they do away the privileges of our members of trial before society, or by a committee, and of an appeal.” The plan adopted by the General Conference, in its operations, turns out of the Methodist Episcopal Church both ministers and members, without disciplinary privileges, and hence, it is unconstitutional, and ought not to be carried into operation by the Bishops and ministers of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

“2. *Resolved*, That we deeply sympathize with the ministers and membership of the Methodist Episcopal Church, who reside within the limits of the Southern Organization, in the troubles and difficulties they are passing through; and that we recommend to them to remain in the Methodist Episcopal

Church; and we further recommend, that in all the Annual Conferences within the limits of the Southern Organization, where there are traveling preachers who still adhere to the Methodist Episcopal Church, to meet and form themselves into the regular Annual Conference; and, in the event there shall be no Bishop present to preside over their deliberations, to appoint a President *pro tem*, as is provided for by the Discipline in the absence of a Bishop.

“3. *Resolved*, That the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, are most respectfully requested to attend the Missouri and Kentucky Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and preside over their deliberations, and make all necessary arrangements to supply the members of the Church, in the above named Annual Conferences, with preachers, to take the pastoral care of them; and to make such further arrangements as they may deem necessary, to supply with preachers all the members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, residing within the boundaries of the self-styled “Methodist Episcopal Church, South.”

“4. *Resolved*, That the action of the Louisville Convention was without any constitutional authority; and, consequently, it can only be regarded as a secession from the Methodist Episcopal Church—that, in view of this being a secession, and of the difficulties now existing in the Church growing out of the revolutionary spirit which caused them, being of such a nature, and to such an extent, it is sufficient to authorize the calling of a special General Conference. The Bishops are, therefore, most respectfully requested and advised, to call a General Conference as soon as practicable.

“5. *Resolved*, That inasmuch as the several Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, are the only constitutional judges and determiners of the acts and doings of the General Conference, it becomes their indispensable duty to determine as to the constitutionality of the so called plan of separation, passed by the late General Conference, at their next several Annual Conferences; and, if they determine it to be unconstitutional, to appoint delegates to the special General Conference, should one be called.

“6. *Resolved*, That as soon as a majority of the Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church shall have concurred in the above resolutions, the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church be, and they are hereby, requested and advised, to proceed immediately to take charge of, and superintend all the ministers and members adhering to the Methodist Episcopal Church within the assumed bounds of the Church “South.”

“7. *Resolved*, That the course pursued by Drs. Bond and

Elliott, during the difficulties in the Church, since the last General Conference, merits the highest praise from the Church; and, that the unmerited abuse which the Southern editors, and others, have attempted to fasten upon them, for their faithful and able defence of the Church, is worthy the cause they espouse, and deserves the stern rebuke of all the friends of the Church."

The same Conference, it appears, adopted a resolution refusing to pay their proportion of the salary or quarterage of Bishops Soule and Andrew. When it is recollected that the Southern Conferences were paying their full share of the salaries of *five* Northern Bishops who render no service whatever in the South, this withholding of quarterage from *two* Southern Bishops, can hardly be regarded as having met too stern a rebuke in the following resolution adopted by unanimous vote of the Missouri Conference:—

"WHEREAS, It appears from documents from Illinois Conference, at its late annual session, that the said Conference refused to pay its share of the Disciplinary allowance to Bishops Soule and Andrew; therefore,

"*Resolved*, That the Missouri Annual Conference order that the Stewards pay the same for the Illinois Conference, and make no charge for the same."

We now come to notice the movements of Conferences in the slaveholding States, and which were represented in the Louisville Convention. The first in order of these is Kentucky. It met September 10, 1845, in Frankfort, Ky., and was attended by Bishops Soule and Andrew. On the first day of the session the following preamble and resolutions were offered to the Conference and adopted:—

"WHEREAS, the long continued agitation and excitement on the subject of slavery and abolition in the Methodist Episcopal Church, and especially such agitation and excitement in the last General Conference, in connection with the civil and domestic relations of Bishop Andrew, as the owner of slave property, by inheritance and marriage, assumed such form in the action had in the case of Bishop Andrew, as to compel the Southern and South-western delegates in that body, to believe, and formally and solemnly to declare, that a state of things must result therefrom which would render impracticable the successful prosecution of the objects and purposes of the Christian ministry and Church organization, in the Annual Conferences within the limits of the slaveholding States;—upon the basis of which declaration, the General Conference adopted a provisional plan of separation, in view of which said Con-

ferences might, if they found it necessary, form themselves into a separate General Conference jurisdiction; and whereas, said Conferences, acting first in their separate Conference capacity, as distinct ecclesiastical bodies, and then collectively, by their duly appointed delegates and representatives, in General Convention assembled, have found and declared such separation necessary, and have further declared a final dissolution, in fact and form, of the jurisdictional connection hitherto existing between *them* and the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church as heretofore constituted; and have organized the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, upon the unaltered basis of the doctrines and discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States before its separation, as authorized by the General Conference; and whereas, said plan of separation, as adopted by the General Conference, and carried out by the late Convention of Southern delegates in the city of Louisville, Kentucky, and also, recognized by the entire Episcopacy as authoritative and of binding obligation in the whole range of their administration, provides that Conferences bordering on the line of division between the two connections—North and South—shall determine by vote of a majority of their members respectively, to which jurisdiction they will adhere; therefore, in view of all the premises, as one of the border Conferences, and subject to the above named rule,

“Resolved, by the Kentucky Annual Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, That in conforming to the General Conference plan of separation, it is necessary that this Conference decide by a vote of a majority of its members to which connection of the Methodist Episcopal Church it will adhere, and that we now proceed to make such decision.

“Resolved, That any member or members of this Conference, declining to adhere to that connection to which the majority shall by regular, official vote decide to adhere, shall be regarded as entitled, agreeably to the plan of separation, to hold their relation to the other ecclesiastical connection—North or South—as the case may be, without blame or prejudice of any kind, unless there be grave objections to the moral character of such member or members, before the date of such formal adherence.

“Resolved, That agreeably to the provisions of the General Conference plan of separation, and the decisions of the Episcopacy with regard to it, any person or persons, from and after the act of non-concurrence with the majority, as above, cannot be entitled to hold membership, or claim any of the rights or privileges of membership in this Conference.

“Resolved, That as a Conference, claiming all the rights,

powers, and privileges of an Annual Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, we *adhere* to the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and that all our proceedings, records, and official acts hereafter, be in the name and style of the Kentucky Annual Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South.

“FRANKFORT, KY., September 10th, 1845.”

The vote on the 4th—the *adhering* resolution—being taken by ayes and noes, stood—ayes 77, noes 6. Four of the six who voted in the negative, afterwards adhered personally to the South; but *three* persons who did not vote on Conference adherence—one being absent and two being probationers—personally adhered to the North. Here the result was very different from the predictions of one party and the apprehensions of the other. The unanimity of sentiment in the Conference and the delightful harmony which prevailed, wielded a mighty influence in promoting harmony in the societies and throughout the Conference. On a line of border of several hundreds of miles, there was found but one small society adhering to the North, while in nearly all the others, not a murmur or complaint was heard. A paper in Kentucky, which had employed all its influence previously against the South, from this time acquiesced and faithfully co-operated with the Conference. True, the Conference had lost two effective men—two young men who might in time have become useful, and a venerable *superannuate*—for whose support during life the Conference gave a generous pledge; but they had gained *five* (and afterwards gained *three*) from the North, all men of experience, weight, and talents.

The second border Conference to act on the question of adherence, was Missouri. Here it was claimed that the Northern party would have a Conference at any rate; for if they could not secure a majority, they would organize with a *minority*, transact the regular business of the Missouri Conference, and draw the dividend from the Book Concern. The better to accomplish their purposes, Bishop Morris was written to and invited to attend the Conference, with a desire that he would take charge of the Northern party. To this invitation he gave the following noble response:—

“BISHOP MORRIS’ LETTER.

“BURLINGTON, IOWA, Sept. 8, 1845.

“Rev. Wilson S. McMurry—Dear Brother,—Your letter of the 1st inst. is now before me. The resolutions to which you refer did pass in the meeting of the Bishops at New York in July, unanimously. We all believe they are in accordance with the plan of separation adopted by the General Confer-

ence. Whether that plan was wise or foolish, constitutional or unconstitutional, did not become us to say, it being our duty, as Bishops, to know what the General Conference ordered to be done in a certain contingency which has actually transpired, and to carry it out in good faith. It is, perhaps, unfortunate that the resolutions were not immediately published, but it was not thought necessary by a majority at the time they passed. Still our administration will be conformed to them. Bishop Soule's notice was doubtless founded upon them.

As I am the responsible man at Indiana Conference, Oct. 8, it will not be in my power to attend Missouri Conference; nor do I think it important to do so. Were I there, I could not, with my views of propriety and responsibility, encourage subdivision. If a majority of the Missouri Conference resolve to come under the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, that would destroy the identity of the Missouri Conference as an integral part of the Methodist Episcopal Church. As to having two Missouri Conferences, each claiming to be the true one, and demanding the dividends of the Book Concern, and claiming the Church property, that is the very thing that the General Conference designed to prevent, by adopting the amicable plan of separation. It is true that the minority preachers have a right, according to the general rule in the plan of separation, to be recognized still in the Methodist Episcopal Church, but in order to that they must go to some adjoining Conference in the Methodist Episcopal Church. The border charges may also, by a majority of votes, decide which organization they will adhere to, and if reported in regular order to the Conference from which they wish to be supplied, or to the Bishops presiding, they will be attended to, on either side of the line of separation. But if any brethren suppose the Bishops will send preachers from the North to interior charges South, or to minorities of border charges, to produce disruption, or that they will encourage minority preachers on either side of the line to organize opposition lines, by establishing one Conference in the bounds of another, they are misled. That would be departing from the plain letter of the rule prescribed by the General Conference, in the premises. Editors may teach such nullification and answer for it; if they will; but the Bishops all understand their duty better than to endorse such principles. I acknowledge that, under the practical operation of the plan of separation, some hard cases may arise; but the Bishops do not make, and have not the power to relieve them. It is the fault of the rule, and not of the executive administration of it. In the mean time, there is much more bad feeling indulged in respecting the separation, than there is necessity for. If the plan of separation had been carried out in

good faith and christian feeling on both sides, it would scarcely have been felt any more than the division of an Annual Conference. It need not destroy confidence or embarrass the work, if the business be managed in the spirit of Christ. I trust the time is not very far distant when brethren, North and South, will cease their hostilities, and betake themselves to their prayers and other appropriate duties in earnest. Then, and not till then, may we expect the Lord to bless us as in former days.

"I am, dear brother, yours respectfully and affectionately,
THOS. A. MORRIS."

Bishop Soule presided over the Conference, and when the question of adherence was taken up, the letter of Bishop Morris was read, and as may be supposed, not without effect.

The same resolutions substantially adopted by Kentucky Conference, were introduced and adopted by this Conference, only 14 voting in the negative, including absentees.

Next, the Holston Conference met: Bishop Andrew presided, and the Conference adopted the following preamble and resolutions, with but one negative vote; and the brother who gave the negative vote, afterwards gave in his adhesion to the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and took work of the Conference as usual:—

The following preamble and resolutions were offered by Samuel Patton, and adopted by a vote of 51 in the affirmative and 1 in the negative. Several members were not in attendance at the Conference.

"WHEREAS, The long continued agitation on the subject of slavery and abolition in the Methodist Episcopal Church, did at the General Conference of said Church, held in the city of New York, in May, 1844, result in the adoption of certain measures by that body, which seriously threatened a disruption of the Church: and to avert this calamity said General Conference did devise and adopt a plan contemplating the peaceful separation of the South from the North; and constituting the Conferences in the slaveholding States the sole judges of the necessity for such separation; and, whereas, the Conferences in the slaveholding States, in the exercise of the right accorded to them by the General Conference, did by their representatives in Convention at Louisville, Ky., in May last, decide that separation was necessary, and proceeded to organize themselves into a separate and distinct ecclesiastical connection, under the style and title of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, basing their claim to a legitimate relation to the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States, upon their unwavering adherence to the "plan of separation,"

adopted by the General Conference of said Church, in 1844, and their devotion to the doctrines, discipline, and usages of the Church as they received them from their fathers.

“And as the plan of separation provides that the Conferences bordering on the geographical line of separation, shall decide their relation by the votes of the majority,—as, also, that ministers of every grade shall make their election North or South without censure,—therefore,

“1. *Resolved*, That we now proceed to determine the question of our ecclesiastical relation, by the vote of the Conference.

“2. That we, the members of the Holston Annual Conference, claiming all the rights, powers and privileges of an Annual Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States, do hereby make our election with, and adhere to the Methodist Episcopal Church, South.

“3. That while we thus declare our adherence to the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, we repudiate the idea of secession in any schismatic or offensive sense of the phrase, as we neither give up nor surrender any thing which we have received as constituting any part of Methodism, and adhere to the Southern ecclesiastical organization, in strict accordance with the provisions of the plan of separation, adopted by the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, at its session in New York, in May, 1844.

“4. That we are satisfied with our Book of Discipline as it is, on the subject of slavery and every other vital feature of Methodism, as recorded in that book; and that we will not tolerate any changes whatever, except such verbal or unimportant alterations as may, in the judgment of the General Conference, facilitate the work in which we are engaged, and promote uniformity and harmony in our administration.

“5. That the journals of our present session, as well as all our official business, be henceforth conformed in style and title to our ecclesiastical relations.

“6. That it is our desire to cultivate and maintain fraternal relations with our brethren of the North. And we do most sincerely deprecate the continuance of paper warfare, either by editors or correspondents in our official Church papers, and devoutly pray for the speedy return of peace and harmony in the Church, both North and South.

“7. That the Holston Annual Conference most heartily commend the course of our beloved Bishops, Soule and Andrew, during the recent agitations which have resulted in the territorial and jurisdictional separation of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and that we tender them our thanks for their steady adherence to principle and the best interests of the slave population.

DAVID ADAMS.”

The Tennessee Conference, which met October 22, 1845, though not a border Conference, adopted the following preamble and resolutions, by a unanimous vote:—

“WHEREAS, The agitation of the questions of slavery and abolition for the last several years, has created great excitement in the Methodist Episcopal Church, destructive of her peace and harmony; and whereas, the General Conference of 1844 did, by extra-judicial act, virtually suspend the Rev. James O. Andrew, one of the Bishops of said Church, for an act in which he was fully sustained by the law and constitution of the Church, and did thereby render a continuance of the Conferences in the slaveholding States under the jurisdiction of said General Conference, inconsistent with the interests of our holy religion, and the great purposes of the christian ministry; and whereas, the said General Conference adopted a plan for a constitutional and peaceable division of the Methodist Episcopal Church into two separate and distinct ecclesiastical jurisdictions; and whereas, the Conferences in the slaveholding States did adjudge such separation imperiously necessary, and did appoint delegates from their respective bodies to meet in General Convention at Louisville, Ky., on the first day of May, 1845; and whereas, said Convention did proceed to declare the separation right, expedient and necessary for the safety and prosperity of the Southern Church, and did proceed, according to the plan of separation provided by the General Conference of 1844, to adopt measures for the organization of a separate and distinct ecclesiastical jurisdiction, known by the name and under the style of “The Methodist Episcopal Church, South,” based on the doctrines and economy of the Methodist Episcopal Church, as set forth in the Discipline of said Church: therefore,

“1. *Resolved*, That we approve the plan of separation as reported by the Committee of Nine, and adopted by the General Conference of 1844.

“2. That we most cordially approve of the entire proceedings of the Southern delegates in the Convention at Louisville, in May, 1845, and that we *solemnly declare* our adherence to the said Southern Organization.

“3. That our journals and all our official records be kept in the name and under the style of the Tennessee Annual Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South.

“4. That we will, at this session, elect delegates to the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, to be held at Petersburg, Va., on the 1st day of May, 1846, according to the ratio of representation (one for every fourteen members of the Conference) fixed at the Louisville Convention.

"5. That we, as ever, heartily believe in the doctrines and approve the government of the Methodist Episcopal Church, as set forth in our articles of faith, and taught in the Discipline, and that we will resist any and every attempt to change any cardinal features of Methodism, as handed down to us by 'our fathers.'

"6. That we highly approve of the course pursued by Bishops Soule and Andrew in their administration, since the occurrence of the difficulties in the General Conference of 1844, and that we sympathise with them in the unjust and ungenerous persecution which has been so bitterly carried on against them in certain portions of the North.

"7. That we properly appreciate the conservative course pursued by the Bench of Bishops, pending the difficulties which for the last eighteen months have so agitated the Church, and specially do we commend their purpose of carrying out, so far as their administration is concerned, the plan of separation adopted by the General Conference of 1844.

"ROBERT PAINE,

"J. B. McFERRIN."

Farther than this we cannot follow the action of the Conferences, nor is it important, as those in which most difficulty and division were apprehended have been noticed.

Methodism has ever been peculiarly the child of Providence, and to follow the guiding star of that Providence has always been her rule of action and her glory. Mr. Wesley was ardently attached to the Church of England, yet following the clear indications of Providence, he was led to establish an independent Church in America, contrary to his personal wishes and long cherished purpose. Nearly all the parts and peculiarities of Methodist economy and rule have been adopted in the same way, without previous concert or design. Southern Methodists have ever been more rigid in their adherence to what they understand to be original Methodism, than any other portion of the American Church. Hence, when the Northern portion of the Church thought the measures adopted by the General Conference of 1844, necessary to the success and prosperity of Methodism in that part of the Union, and when the South were convinced that the same measures must work the utter ruin of Methodism in the slaveholding States, or a division of the Church, Southern hearts felt and bled more deeply than any others; but terrible as was the mental struggle, and painful the alternative, when they believed they saw the star of Divine Providence leading the way, and the salvation of the Southern Church and the African race in the proposed arrangement, they yielded a sorrowful acquiescence

to the stern necessity of the case. And trusting in the future guidance of Heaven's good Providence, they went forth to cultivate the vineyard in which they were called to labor for their Master, believing that if it were of God, his blessing would be upon them and upon the work of their hands; but if not, that it would come to naught. But their hearts and hands have been strengthened mightily—the seal of Heaven's approbation has been set upon their course—the gracious work of the Lord has been gloriously revived—thousands have been brought to the knowledge of salvation, and Ethiopia with glad heart is stretching out her hands unto God.

INDEX.

A

	<i>Page.</i>
Abolition petition from a northern Annual Conference presented to General Conference,	1
Action of General Conference in case of Bishop Andrew disapproved by Kentucky Conference,	109
Missouri “	125
Holston “	127
Tennessee “	129
Memphis “	132
Mississippi “	135
Arkansas “	137
Virginia “	141
N. Carolina “	143
S. Carolina “	144
Georgia “	148
Florida “	153
Texas “	154
Alabama “	156
Address of Southern Delegates in General Conference to ministers and members in the South,	105
Address of Bishop Soule to General Conference,	48
Andrew to General Conference,	42
Soule to Convention,	173
of Kentucky Conference on division of the Church,	111
Adherence of Conferences, stations, and societies, to be de- cided by vote,	91
Alabama Conference, resolutions of, on division,	156
Ambiguity of General Conference decision in Bishop An- drew's case,	158
Annual Conferences fail to change the 6th restriction,	168
Ayes and noes on the compromise proposed to the Gene- ral Conference by the Bishops,	67
Ayes and noes on Bishop Andrew's case,	67
on Mitchell's resolutions,	89

Ayes and Noes on first Resolution of Plan,	99
on 2nd and 5th " " Plan,	100
on the 1st organizing resolution,	186
on 2d " "	187
on additional report,	188
on main report,	199
on inviting Bishops Soule and Andrew to unite with the South,	199

B

Baltimore Conference, new position of in Harding's case,	2
proceedings of in Harding's case,	3
Bangs Dr. N. remarks on Bishop Andrew's case,	22
explanation by,	35
advocates plan of separation,	94
opposes course of leading Church papers North,	238
Bascom Dr. H. B., his testimony respecting object of reso- lution of 1840,	9
presents Protest of Southern Delegates,	73
his "Methodism and Slavery,"	238
" " replied to by Dr. Peck,	238
Berryman Mr., remarks of on case of Bishop Andrew,	21
Bishop Andrew's case not the <i>real</i> cause of General Con- ference action,	12
Bishop Andrew his response to committee on Episcopacy,	16
his marriage constituted his offense,	23
his address to General Conference,	42
his case decided,	68
kept in suspense as to action of Bishops in his case,	158
his response to Bishop Soule's letter invi- ting him to work,	159
his reply to the Convention on uniting with the South,	200
Bishops permitted to speak in General Conference in Bishop Andrew's case,	48
their proposition of compromise in Bishop An- drew's case,	64
their proposition of compromise rejected by Gen- eral Conference,	67
their proposition of compromise, vote on, by Gen- eral Conference,	67
letter asking explanation of action in Bishop An- drew's case,	88
publication explaining their course towards Bish- op Andrew,	165

Bishops, meeting of, at New York, in July, 1845,	236
their resolutions at that meeting,	237
their course approved by Holston Conference,	129
“ “ “ by Mississippi Conference,	136
“ “ “ by Texas Conference,	154
Bishop Hedding withdraws his name from compromise,	66
Waugh refuses to withdraw his “ “	66
Morris “ “ “ “ “	66
Soule's Address to General Conference,	48
Letter inviting Bishop Andrew to labor,	161
his letter defending the measure,	168
his reply to the Convention as to uniting with the South,	200
his presiding in Northern Conferences op- posed,	236
his ejection from Chair of Ohio Conference,	240
Bishops all invited to attend the Conv. by Kentucky Con.,	111
Missouri “	127
Holston “	129
Tennessee “	131
Memphis “	134
Mississippi “	136
Arkansas “	139
S. Carolina “	146
Georgia “	152
Alabama “	156

Bond Dr. T. E., opposed giving border societies a choice in division,	97
Bowen Mr., his remarks on case of Bishop Andrew,	21

C

Capers Dr., his speech,	62
plan of division,	79
referred to committee,	70
Cartwright Mr., opposed to the plan of separation,	93
Central Church Organ, its violent opposition to General Conference plan of separation,	108
followed by W. C. Advocate,	108
Church, unity of, not affected by the separation,	93
primitive not more united than M. E. Church af- ter division, Dr. Elliott,	93
Collins Rev. J. A., his position on the practicability of eman- cipation in Maryland,	4
on the <i>usage</i> of the Church,	41
his preamble and resolutions of compromise,	42
moves to adopt Bishops' compromise,	65
advocates plan of separation,	97

Coleman Mr., his remarks on case of Bishop Andrew,	21
Comfort Mr., remarks on Finley's substitute,	37
Committee on Drs. Capers and Olin's proposition of compromise,	12
Committee on Drs. Capers and Olin's proposition, failure of to agree on plan,	15
Committee on Episcopacy report of in case of Bishop Andrew,	15
Committee of Nine appointed on Declaration,	72
instructed to report constitutional plan of division,	72
Compromise, proposition for, by Drs. Capers and Olin,	12
recommended by the Bishops,	64
rejected,	67
vote on,	67
Compromise, plan for by Holston Conference,	128
rejected by Tennessee Conference,	132
Mississippi	137
Georgia	152
Florida	153
Alabama	157
Convention recommended by Southern delegates at N. Y.	104
meets in Louisville,	169
Conferences represented in,	169
organized by appointment of President and Secretary pro tem.	169
names of delegates in,	170
resolution of inviting Bishops to preside,	170
election by of Secretary and assistant,	171
appointment of committee on public worship,	171
to prepare rules,	171
to publish proceedings,	172
rules of order for adopted,	172
Address to by Bishop Soule on accepting chair,	173
Committee on Missions appointed by,	176
on organization,	176
instructions of to committee on organization,	178
Committee on Education appointed by,	180
Committee of Finance,	180
Committee on Book Concern, &c., appointed by, and petitions referred to,	182-3 & 4
resolutions of to restrict debate,	183
Dr. Smith adopted by,	184
Report of Committee on Missions taken up,	185
and letter adopted,	189
on Organization read to,	185

Convention, Report of Committee on Organization taken	
up, first resolution adopted,	186
second “ “	187
additional report adopted by,	188
report to by financial committee,	194
resolution by Education Committee, adopted by,	194
Book agents appointed by,	195
report on Book Concern adopted,	195
report on History of Organization,	197
report on organization adopted,	199
invite Bishops Soule and Andrew to unite with	
the South,	199
Response of Bishops to,	200
committee of revision appointed by	199
Report on Transylvania University adopted,	201
Pastoral Address of,	202
resolutions of concerning border societies, &c.,	106
of concerning Pastoral Letter,	106
its influence on the public mind,	235
Crandall Mr., his remarks on Capers and Olin's proposition,	14
Crowder Mr., remarks on case of Bishop Andrew,	22

D

Declaration of Southern Delegates,	71
referred to Committee of Nine,	72
Decision, final in case of Bishop Andrew,	68
vote on,	68
Delegates from South meet at New York after General	
Conference,	104
recommend plan of operation,	104
a Convention,	104
Address to the Church in the South,	105
Division of the Church predicted as result of action of	
General Conference,	21
of Church property provided for,	91
commissioners appointed to make,	92
desirable apart from slavery question,	
Dr. Elliott,	93
Drake Mr., his remarks on Finley's substitute,	26
proposed resolution,	27
resolution of instruction,	179
Dunwoody Mr., remarks of,	48
Durbin Dr., his remarks on Capers and Olin's compromise	
proposition,	14
remarks on Finley's substitute,	60
resolution of compromise,	61

E

Early Mr., his remarks on Capers and Olin's proposition,	15
Effect on the South of rejecting the exposition of slavery law given in the resolution of 1840,	10
Elliott Dr. proposed to refer Declaration to committee,	72
advocated division,	93
Events subsequent to the Convention,	234
Excitement produced by Bishop Soule's invitation to Bishop Andrew,	163
Expediency, doctrine of,	19
opposed,	20 & 21
advocated,	21 & 22
Expost facto, Mr. Spencer's construction of,	22
Exposition of slavery law in Bishops' address 1840,	7
in address of General Conference of 1840 to British Conference,	7
by Rev. J. B. Finley,	7
by Report of 1840,	9
Expectation of difficulties in General Conference of 1844,	1

F

Failure of Capers and Olin's compromise plan,	15
Fast day appointed with reference to the Convention	
by Kentucky Conference,	111
Mississippi "	137
Arkansas "	139
Indian Mission "	148
Texas "	155
Alabama "	157
Filmore Mr., advocates plan of separation,	95
explains object of changing 6th restriction,	99
Finley Mr., his resolution in Bishop Andrew's case,	23
remarks on " " " "	23 & 47
advocates plan of separation,	94
Florida Conference, resolutions of on division,	153

G

Griffith Mr., his remarks against laws of Maryland,	5
preamble and resolutions against Bishop Andrew,	17
remarks on said resolution,	18
opposed to plan of separation,	93
Georgia Conference, resolutions of on division,	151
Report of on "	148
General Superintendency, remarks on,	61

H

Hamline Mr., his speech on Finley's resolution,	35
advocates plan of separation,	97
explains object of changing 6th restriction,	98
Harding's case—its influence on that of Bishop Andrew,	4
appeal introduced,	2
proceedings of Baltimore Conference on,	2
statement of,	3
Hedding, Bishop, withdraws his name from the compromise,	66
History of resolution of 1840 explanatory of slavery law,	8
organization of M. E. Church, South, provided for by Convention,	196
Holston Conference, action of subsequent to the Conven- tion,	250
resolutions of on division,	128

I

Indian Mission Conference, resolution of on division,	147
Influence of the Convention on the public mind,	235
Instruction to committee on slavery,	2
of <i>Nine</i> ,	72
asked by the Bishops concerning Bishop An- drew,	88

K

Kentucky Conference, resolutions of on division,	109
address of on division, &c.,	111
action of subsequent to the Louis- ville Convention,	246

L

Letter of Bishop Soule explaining his course in case of Bishop Andrew,	163
Longstreet Dr., his remarks on Finley's substitute,	31
presents his declaration of Southern dele- gates,	71
remarks on the declaration,	72

M

Marriage, the offense of Bishop Andrew,	23
Meeting of Southern delegates after General Conference at New York,	104
of Bishops in New York, July, 1845,	238
Ministers of every grade and office at liberty to adhere North or South,	91

Position of the three parties after the action in Harding's case,	11
Power of General Conference over Bishops,	18
Plan of separation presented,	90
Plan of operations proposed by Southern delegates at N. Y.,	104
Proceedings of Baltimore Conference in case of Harding,	2
commenced in case of Bishop Andrew,	15
Primitive Church not more closely united than M. E.	
Church after division, Dr. Elliott,	93
Publication by the Bishops, explaining their course to-	
wards Bishop Andrew,	165
Protest, names signed to,	87
ordered to record,	88
committee to reply to appointed,	88
of Southern delegates presented,	73
of the minority of the Ohio Conference,	242

R

Remarks on the case of Bishop Andrew, by	
Mr. Griffith,	18
Dr. Winans,	20
Mr. Bowen of Oneida Conf.,	21
Dr. L. Pierce of Ga. “	21
Mr. Berryman,	21
Coleman,	21
Stringfield,	21
Crowder of Va. “	22
Spencer of Pittsburgh,	22
Dr. Bangs,	22
Remarks on Finley's substitute, by Dr. Olin,	23
Mr. Drake,	26
Slicer of Balt.,	27
Crandall,	27
Cass of N. H.,	27
G. F. Pierce,	29
Dr. Longstreet,	31
J. T. Peck,	31
Mr. Green of Tenn.	34
Hamline,	35
Comfort,	37
Dr. Smith of Va.,	37
Mr. Collins of Balt.,	41
Sehon,	46
Dr. Winans,	46
Mr. Finley,	47
Cartwright,	47
Stamper,	47
Dr. Durbin,	60
Dr. Capers,	62

Remarks on the Declaration, by Mr. Sandford,	72
Dr. Longstreet,	72
Dr. Olin,	72
Remarks in favor of Plan of separation, Dr. Elliott,	93
Dr. Lucky,	94
Dr. Bangs,	94
Mr. Filmore,	95
Mr. Finley,	96
Mr. Hamline,	97
in opposition to, Mr. Griffith,	93
Mr. Cartwright,	83
in favor of <i>positive</i> boundary, Dr. Bond,	97
plan of separation, Mr. Collins,	97
in opposition to " Mr. Sandford,	98
Remarks explaining object of changing sixth restrictive rule,	
Dr. Winans,	98
Mr. Hamline,	983
Mr. Filmore,	99
Dr. Bangs,	94
Reply of Drs. Durbin, Peck and Elliott to Protest,	101
brief analysis of,	102-3
denies that the action against Bishop Andrew was <i>judicial</i> or <i>punitive</i> ,	102
asserts that the Church never a had slaveholding Bishop,	102
inconsistencies in,	102
charges Bishop Andrew with <i>impeachable</i> offense,	102
produced excitement,	103
singular proceedings on,	103
vote on recording and printing it,	103
Report of South Carolina Conference on division,	143
Georgia, " "	148
Resolution introduced instructing committee on slavery,	2
of inquiry in case of Bishop Andrew,	15
of Mr. Griffith against Bishop Andrew,	17
of Mr. Finley, a substitute,	23
proposed by Mr. Drake,	27
of compromise by Mr. Collins,	42
Dr. Durbin,	61
of Slicer and Sargent declaring action in case of Bishop Andrew advisory, and postponing case until 1848,	[69
laid on table,	69
Resolutions on Division by Dr. Capers,	70
referred to Committee,	71
of Dr. Olin explanatory of Southern Conference action,	72

Resolutions instructing Committee of Nine to report constitutional plan of division,	72
explanatory of action in Bishop Andrew's case,	89
votes on,	89
equivocal character of,	90
of Kentucky Conference on division, &c.,	109
Missouri	125
Holston	128
Tennessee	130
Memphis	132
Mississippi	135
Arkansas	137
Virginia	140
North Carolina	142
South Carolina	146
Indian Mission	147
Georgia	151
Florida	153
Texas	154
Alabama	156
Resolutions of Bishop's council at New York,	237
its salutary influence,	237
North Ohio Conference nullifying Plan,	240
Ohio Conference ejecting Bishop Soule from the chair,	241
Restrictive rules, provision for changing,	91
Annual Conferences refuse to change,	168
reasons for changing, not division,	98

S

Sandford Mr., his remarks on case of Bishop Andrew,	19
remarks on Declaration,	72
Separation, rule to be observed with regard to,	91
Slavery law, construction of by Mr. Collins,	6
exposition of by General Conference of 1840,	7
reflections on Mr. Collins' construction of,	7
exposition of in Bishops' address to General Conference of 1840,	7
exposition of in address of General Conference of 1840 to British Conference,	7
exposition of by Rev. J. B. Finley,	7
by the <i>Report</i> of 1840,	9
Smith Dr., his remarks on Capers and Olin's proposition,	15
his explanation of a rumor about Northern movements,	17
Speech on Finley's substitute,	37

Smith Dr., his resolution instructing Committee on Organization,	179
Societies, stations, and Conferences to decide on adherence,	91
Southern delegates meet after General Conference for consultation,	104
Plan of operations proposed by them,	104
South grew more calm and North less, as controversy progressed,	108
Southern Delegates, their course approved by	
Kentucky Conf.,	110
Missouri	127
Holston	129
Tennessee	131
Memphis	134
Mississippi	136
Arkansas	139
Virginia	141
South Carolina	147
Indian Mission	149
Georgia	152
Florida	153
Texas	154
South denounced as a secession by leading Northern papers,	235
Soule, Bishop, Address to General Conference,	48
adheres to the compromise,	66
Spencer Mr., his remarks on case of Bishop Andrew,	22
State of things immediately preceding the General Conference of 1844,	1
Stamper Mr., his remarks on Finley's substitute,	47
Stringfield Mr., his remarks on case of Bishop Andrew,	21
Supremacy of the General Conference asserted,	35
Superintendency general, remarks on,	61

T

Tennessee Conference, resolutions of on division,	129
Texas Conference, resolutions of on division,	154
Transylvania University, resolutions concerning it by Convention,	201
Tennessee Conference, action of subsequent to the Convention,	252

V

Virginia Conference, resolutions of on division,	140
Vote of General Conference on appeal of Harding,	6
Bishop Andrew's case,	67

Vote of General Conference on Bishop's compromise,	67
Mitchell's resolution,	89
first resolution in plan of separation,	99
2d, 3d, and 4th,	100
the Reply to the Protest,	103
Vote of Kentucky Conference on resolutions on division,	109
Memphis	132
North Carolina	143
Georgia	148
Indian Mission	148
Florida	153

W

Waugh, Bishop, adheres to the Bishop's compromise,	66
Winans Dr., his remarks on case of Bishop Andrew,	20
Finley's substitute,	46
declares the South satisfied with the Bishops' compromise,	67
explains object of changing 6th restriction,	98
his resolution instructing Organizing Committee of Convention,	178







GAYLORD		PRINTED IN U.S.A.

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S. A.



